THE

ANTI-JACOBIN

Review and Magazine,

&c. &c. &c.

For NOVEMBER, 1804.

Hoc ferè accepimus, ut Regum afflictæ fortunæ facilè multorum opes alliciant ad misericordiam, maximèque eorum, qui aut Reges sunt, aut vivunt in regno; quòd Regale iis nomen magnum et sanctum esse videatur.

CICERO.

ORIGINAL CRITICISM.

An Historical Review of the State of Ireland, from the Invasion of that Country by Henry II. *to the Union with Great Britain on the 1st of January* 1801. By Fr. Plowden, Esq. in 2 Vols. 4to. T. Egerton, London, 1803.

A Postliminious Preface to the Historical Review of the State of Ireland, by Fr. Plowden, Esq. *containing a Statement of the Author's Communications with the Right Honourable Henry Addington, and some of his Colleagues, upon the subject of that Work; some strictures on the falsities of the British Critic; and other anonymous Traducers of the Irish Nation, and also some observations on Lord Redesdale's Letters to the Earl of Fingal.* 4to. Carpenter, London, 1804.

THE volumes now before us exhibit the most striking example we ever met with of an incessant and laborious endeavour to defeat the *avowed* object of their publication. The writer *pretends* to have compiled them with the view of softening every existing national asperity, of giving the most salutary effect to the union of Great Britain and Ireland: while, in fact, he labours with indefatigable industry to retard that conciliation and mutual advantage which an union of the Kingdom, and a sameness of interest must in time produce. Every thing which can excite the irascible passions of a high spirited people, whatever can foster the prejudices of a nation, which has many prejudices, is called forth by an industry most persevering and unwearied. A determined partisan of Ireland, the writer brings

forward every thing which can flatter and keep alive the animoſity of that country, and lead the Iriſh to conſider their union with Britain as a mortifying degradation. The Mileſian Legends are produced as *undoubted* hiſtory, we are told that "no nation now in fact upon the face of the globe can boaſt of ſuch *certain* and remote antiquity," and that the Iriſh "have more family pride than any other nation." What is the conſequence which Mr. P. or at leaſt every ſenſible man thinks muſt neceſſarily follow from *his* exhibition of this *undoubted* hiſtory, and from his partial emblazonment of this *family pride?* What are the natural feelings of an Iriſhman who believes in Mr. P. and who has this family pride? He muſt, for the glory of his nation, and for his own individual honour, do every thing in his power, exert every nerve to prevent the deſcendants of Mileſius, Heber, Eremon, and Ith from ſinking into one people with the upſtart and mongrel race of Britons, Saxons, Danes, Norwegians, Normans, &c.

If we add to this another ſingular recipé for *conciliation* of this very ſingular writer, viz. his repreſenting almoſt every act of the Engliſh reſpecting Ireland and Iriſhmen as treacherous or tyrannical, and his pourtraying the Iriſh almoſt always as good and loyal ſubjects, more ſinned againſt than ſinning, the reader will have reached the very pith and marrow of this *conciliating* Hiſtorical Review of——we have not time to count how many thouſand pages!

To gratify the Iriſh pride of anceſtry, and their claims to a high ſtate of civilization, and importance as an enlightened people when a great part of Europe was ſunk in barbariſm, Mr. P. in the 19th century very gravely retails the legend of Mileſius and his Phœnicians; which he tells us with equal gravity, is an hiſtorical fact beyond "all doubt." In proof of this ſome paſſages in Plautus, ſpoken by Hanno, a Carthaginian, are produced, which paſſages General Vallancey, with no ſmall turning and twiſting; has converted into modern Iriſh. But, ſuppoſing that, without the ſmalleſt change of words or ſyllables, theſe were found to be good Iriſh, what proof can it be of the Phœnician colonization of Ireland? The extenſive range of the Celtic language is well known; and it is not improbable that the Carthaginians may have ſpoken a dialect of that language; but does it follow that they, or the ſtock from whence they were derived, the Phœnicians, muſt have therefore colonized Ireland? We know for certain from Cæſar, that he found a Celtic nation in poſſeſſion of great part of Gaul, and, without ſaying more, have no ſcruple to leave it to the good ſenſe of our readers which is moſt likely to be true, that both Great Britain and Ireland were originally peopled, and the Celtic language introduced from that quarter, or that Ireland ſhould have had the peculiar privilege about 500 or 1000 years before the Chriſtian æra, (for the *Mileſianites*, are far from agreed about the time of his arrival) to receive its language from the apocryphal Phœnician adventurer. We ſhould have paſſed by this part of the work without

out animadverſion, were it not obvious that it is for other purpoſes than the mere pleaſure of the ride that the writer mounts this national hobby-horſe. Will an Iriſhman be contented that his country ſhould have become a part of the muſhroom kingdom of Britain, when he beholds all this ſplendid diſplay of remote antiquity, and national importance? Will he not rather be induced to exclaim with O'Flagherty "my country" "engendered of her own bowels 171 monarchs for above 2000 years, to the year 1198, all of the ſame houſe and lineage,' "and ſhall I, can I ſubmit to ſuch an indignity, I (he will very likely add) who have the honour to ſpring from that venerable ſtock?" If we add to this other ſimilar *conciliatory* ſtimulants, which are far from thinly ſtrewed over this publication.—That "the embaſſadors from England at the Council of Conſtance were refuſed the rank and precedency, were not even allowed to rank or take any place as the embaſſadors of a nation," for this notable reaſon, that "Europe was divided into four empires, the Roman, the Conſtantinopolitan, the *Iriſh!* and the Spaniſh" that they ſubmitted, "and claimed their precedency and rank from Henry's being monarch of Ireland *only*." P. 22.—"That, ſince Ireland has become connected with, or rather ſubjected to England, it has ceaſed to perform the part of a nation on the political theatre of the univerſe, we bring our minds with difficulty to believe the accounts of her leading eminence on that theatre, before ſuch connexion or ſubjection took place." Pp. 20-21. That "the ſtate of pre-eminence which Ireland ſo long enjoyed amidſt the nations of Europe, ſhews to what a degree of conſequence ſhe is capable of riſing when her native powers are not cramped by internal diviſions, or damped by *foreign* (Engliſh) power, oppreſſion and rigour." P. 22. When we read theſe, and numberleſs other paſſages, equally *conciliatory*, can we conſider them in any other view than as ſtimulants to the Iriſh "to emulate their priſtine glory," p. 22, to rouſe Ireland from her long *infelicity* ſince ſhe has been dependent on or connected with this country," p. 10, and to reſume her leading *independent* eminence on the theatre of the Univerſe, before ſuch connection, or ſubjection took place? No, ſays Mr. P. do I not recommend an union as the ſovereign remedy for the cure of all theſe political maladies? Have I not ſaid "What but union with Great Britain could ſo effectually withdraw the checks and obſtacles too long thrown in the way of Iriſh greatneſs?" P 22. True you have *ſaid* ſo, but you muſt pardon us for thinking *your conciliatory* proceſs a moſt extraordinary means for producing a cordial union: and we are much miſtaken if the world be not of the ſame opinion. When you wiſh to promote a thorough reconciliation between two individuals who had long been at variance, do you ſay to the one "you have for many years ſuffered every ſpecies of injuſtice and indignity, you have been oppreſſed, robbed, and beaten: I put you in mind of theſe things to quiet every angry paſſion, and that you ſhould be henceforth this man's friend." Do you ſay to the other "you have been uniformly tyrannical and cruel to this perſon,

you have treated him like a dog, though he is, and I have told him ſo, a deſcendant of the moſt ancient family in Europe, and you but a man of yeſterday: he was a gentleman when you was a peaſant, and beſides taught you to read and write *gratis*.*" If you do we will venture to predict that no one acquainted with your *conciliating noſtrum* will ever employ you as a *make-peace*.

But Mr. P. juſtifies his very objectionable work by ſaying that he writes hiſtory, and, as an hiſtorian, muſt ſpeak the truth; and "he avers that it contains no wilful hiſtorical miſrepreſentation." Suppoſing this to be the caſe, that his hiſtory is a paragon of verity, does he not know that truth, when unſeaſonably told, may be, and is often productive of the moſt fatal conſequences? Or, can he, or any man of common ſenſe for a moment believe that, *ſuch as it is*, this publication can ſtrengthen the bands of conciliation? Had he been *compelled* at this critical period to write his Hiſtorical Review, and had he been impartial, whatever bad conſequences might have followed could not have been laid to his charge: but he was a volunteer, an eager volunteer, for what purpoſe he beſt knows, and is anſwerable for every conſequence. Still however, as he pretends to be the champion of truth, and that *fiat Juſtitia, ruat Coelum* is his governing maxim, let us examine one or two of *his* verities.

What he ſays of Tyrone and Tyrconnel, of the rebellion of Sir Cahir O'Dogherty, and of the ſubſequent confiſcations, and diſtribution of the forfeited lands by James I. affords a ſtriking proof of his adherence to truth? No, but of the moſt groſs hiſtorical miſrepreſentation. The treaſon of Tyrone and Tyrconnel is in effect denied, becauſe no proof "of overt acts" (p. 104) appeared againſt them. The fact is that, conſcious of their guilt, they fled the country, and of courſe were not tried; but they, as well as ſome fugitive conſpirators "of inferior note were attainted by proceſs of outlawry, and ſome of the conſpirators, who had been ſeized, were tried, condemned, and executed." Leland, Pp. 424-5. Had this been a ſham plot, as the preſent, and other popiſh writers contend, why did thoſe immaculate earls ſit down quietly under the heavy and unjuſt imputation of treaſon? Why not vindicate their character? They were more modeſt than their apologiſt, and died without leaving behind them a ſingle exculpatory memorial.

Mr. P. confeſſes that Sir Cahir O'Dogherty did commit overt acts, that he was in actual rebellion: but he gives him as much of his white-waſh as he can, he was in rebellion *only* about five months." (P. 104) What would this writer have? Would he have a rebellious Iriſhman emulate Arioſto's hero, who "*andava combatando, e era morto?*" Sir C'D. did what mortal rebel could, he quitted re-

* Such of our anceſtors as went over to Ireland for education, were maintained, taught, and furniſhed with books without fee or reward."—Hiſtorical Review, p 21.

bellion

bellion only with his life, being ſhot in the field, executing one of his overt acts of rebellion.

By theſe conſpiracies and rebellions an extenſive tract of country in the north of Ireland became *forfeited*, a tract

"Covered with woods, where robbers and rebels found a ſecure ſhelter, deſolated by war and famine, and deſtined to lie waſte, without the deliberate and vigorous interpoſition of Engliſh Government. James, who affected to derive his glory from the arts of peace, reſolved to diſpoſe of theſe lands in ſuch a manner, as might introduce all the happy conſequences of peace and cultivation. The experience of time bears the moſt honourable teſtimony to the deſign: and Ireland muſt gratefully acknowledge that here were the firſt foundations laid of its affluence and ſecurity." (Leland, V. Pp. 429-30.)

Let us now ſee in what colours this tranſaction is painted by our very impartial hiſtorian. "From that period King James entered upon his favourite ſcheme of forming a plantation for the avowed purpoſe of excluding the old inhabitants, and introducing the *new* religion." (P. 105.) "Inſtead of opening her arms to embrace and admit Ireland to an equal participation of all her own rights and privileges, ſhe (England) diſpeoples one fourth of the kingdom, and doles out a large extent of the moſt ancient inheritances in Europe (or the *univerſe!*) to ſtrangers, adventurers, and oppreſſors." (P. 106.) Strong indeed muſt be that tendency to miſrepreſentation which can thus fly in the face of well-known truth. James did *not* exclude the old inhabitants, he did *not* diſpeople one fourth of the kingdom, on the contrary, he ſent into Ireland a race of ſober and induſtrious men who have converted a barren wild into a productive country, who introduced the mechanic arts; and the linen manufactory is the work of his hands. This we cannot help thinking was the moſt loving embrace that James could give to Ireland at the time. We ſhould regret his having doled out the *ancient* inheritances of the deſcendants of Mileſius, could Mr. P. once prove to us that antiquity of family gives a ſanction to rebellion, and exempts from legal puniſhment for that heinous crime; till he can do this, we muſt beg leave to think, though in the teeth of his opinion, that there is ſome degree of common ſenſe in the law of the land.

By placing a few of the regulations laid down for the plantation in queſtion before our readers, the miſrepreſentations of this writer will appear ſtill more groſs. We have already ſaid that the diſtrict which Mr. P. tells us was diſpeopled by James, was, in fact, a waſte covered with woods, the retreats of robbers and rebels. By orders from the King this diſtrict was ſurveyed, and the lands aſſigned to ſettlers from Great Britain; or to

"Servitors, as they were called, that is to men who had for ſome time ſerved in Ireland, either in military or civil offices; or to *old Iriſh chieftains and inhabitants.* In the laſt ſort were included even *thoſe Irish who had engaged in the rebellion of Tyrone, and ſtill harboured their ſecret diſcontents.* To gain

them, if poſſible, by favour and lenity, they were treated with particular indulgence. Their under-tenants were allowed to be of their own country and religion; and while all the other tenants were obliged to take the oath of ſupremacy, they were tacitly exempted. The ſervitors were allowed to take their tenants either from Britain or Ireland, ſo that no recuſants were admitted: the Britiſh ſettlers were confined to entertain Engliſh or Scottiſh only." (Leland, Vol. II. Pp. 430-31.)

The old natives, as well as the other ſettlers,

"Had power to erect manours, to hold courts-baron, and to create tenures: but they were enjoined to ſet their lands at certain rents, and for the like terms as the other ſettlers, to take no Iriſh exactions from their inferior tenants, and to oblige them to forſake their old Scythian cuſtom of wandering with their cattle from place to place for paſture, or *creaghting*, as they called it; to dwell in towns, and conform to the Engliſh manner of tillage and huſbandry." (Ib. 433.)

Such are ſome of the wiſe and ſalutary regulations of this ſettlement, the good conſequences of which are ſo apparent at the preſent day. Such is the tranſaction which Mr. P. has choſen to repreſent as the depopulation of a fourth part of the kingdom of Ireland, as an unjuſt and tyrannical transfer of the moſt ancient inheritances in the univerſe into the hands of ſtrangers, adventurers, and oppreſſors! Had he thus turned aſide from hiſtorical truth for the purpoſe of irritation, of exaſperating the minds of the Iriſh againſt Britain, whatever we might have thought of the *honeſty*, we could have found no fault with the *expediency* of the meaſure: but Mr. P. tells us he is a peace-maker, from ſuch a peace-maker we can only ſay Good Lord deliver us!

This conciliating compiler of hiſtory, when he comes to ſpeak of the Iriſh rebellion in 1641, tells us "Here I wiſh to draw an impervious veil over every ſcene of blood and horror, which defiled the actors, as well as over the imaginary fictions and exaggerations which have diſgraced moſt of our hiſtorical relations of theſe tranſactions." (Vol. I. p. 137.) But of what does this impervious veil conſiſt? of every thing which can be brought in juſtification of the rebellion, of every fiction and exaggeration of the popiſh party. The Iriſh are every where juſtified, the Engliſh every where condemned, and the *rebellion* is tranſmuted under the plaſtic hands of this writer into a ſyſtem of *ſelf-defence*, "the whole body of the Catholic nobility and gentry was compelled, for ſelf-preſervation, to unite in a regular ſyſtem of ſelf-defence; which to this day is moſt unwarrantably and unjuſtly ſtiled an odious and unnatural rebellion." (Vol. I. p. 141.) The nature of our publication forbids our entering into a refutation of all his fictions and exaggerations on this ſubject; but from the maſs we ſhall ſelect one ſpecimen. Sir Phelim O'Nial had attacked Liſburn, a Scottiſh ſettlement, (let it be remembered that the Iriſh had promiſed to leave the Scotch unmoleſted) and was repulſed with great loſs; this, and other defeats had excited in the breaſt of this

ſavage

ſavage leader and his no leſs ſavage followers, the moſt barbarous frenzy.

"On the repulſe of his forces at the caſtle of Augher, he ordered his execrable agent, Mac-Donnel, to maſſacre all the Britiſh Proteſtants in three adjacent pariſhes. The defeat at Liſburn provoked this ſavage and his barbarous followers to a degree of rage truly diabolical. Lord Caulfield, who had been conveyed to one of the houſes of O'Nial, was wantonly and baſely murdered. Fifty others, in the ſame place, fell by the poniards of the Iriſh. Their miſerable priſoners, confined in different quarters, were now brought out, under pretence of being conducted to the next Engliſh ſettlements. Their guards goaded them forward like beaſts, exulting in their ſufferings, and determined on the deſtruction of thoſe who had not already ſunk under their tortures. Sometimes they encloſed them in ſome houſe or caſtle, which they ſet on fire, with a brutal indifference to their cries, and a helliſh triumph over their expiring agonies. Sometimes the captive Engliſh were plunged into the firſt river, to which they had been driven by their tormentors. One hundred and ninety were, at once, precipitated from the bridge of Portadown. Iriſh eccleſiaſtics were ſeen encouraging the carnage. The women forgot the tenderneſs of their ſex; purſued the Engliſh with execrations, and embrued their hands in blood: even children, in their feeble malice, lifted the dagger againſt the helpleſs priſoners.

Exaſperated by theſe barbarous murders, ſome Scottiſh ſoldiers of the garriſon of Carricfergus, with equal brutality, did in the beginning of January 1642, maſſacre about 30 poor families in a ſmall narrow neck of land called Iſland Magee or Mac-Gee. This atrocious deed, which we are far from juſtifying, Mr. P. and other Popiſh writers have magnified beyond every limit of probability; we are told that "above 3000 men, women and children" were maſſacred. For this he indeed quotes Lord Clarendon, but how much that writer muſt have been miſinformed will beſt appear by ſtating that Iſland Magee is a ſmall ſlip of land on the ſea-coaſt of Antrim, which even now, when the population of the country muſt have greatly increaſed, does not contain 300 inhabitants. This is not all, Mr. P. ſtill covering himſelf with the ſhield of Lord C. informs us that this act was perpetrated "when none of the Catholics of that country were in arms or rebellion." To this the rebellion and barbarities of Sir Phelim O'Nial, an account of which we have quoted from Leland, and which took place in October 1641, and the following months, will be conſidered as a ſatisfactory anſwer. From this miſrepreſentation Mr. P. draws the concluſion which he wiſhes his readers to adopt, viz. that the *firſt* Iriſh maſſacre was perpetrated by Proteſtants! Had he here paid the ſame attention to Leland, as he does when that author's narrative does not thwart his purpoſe, and a little attention to truth, he would have found "that the maſſacre of Iſland Magee, (as appears from ſeveral unſuſpicious evidences, depoſitions of the county of Antrim, MSS. Trin. Col. Dub.) was really committed in the beginning of January (1642), when the followers of

O'Neal had almoſt exhauſted their barbarous malice." (Leland, Vol. III. p. 129.)

The ſame ſpirit pervades the whole of this cumbrous publication. The Engliſh are every where repreſented as unjuſt tyrants, and the rebellions and enormities of the Iriſh from age to age, are ſoftened down into the exertions of a noble and high ſpirited people in defence of their rights. From his Mileſian dreams to the completion of his work we find either continued miſrepreſentation, or a narrative which, inſtead of conciliating, can only tend to irritate the united nation. Even the incorporate union, which, in the concluſion of his work, he *juſtly* ſays, was "an event dreaded by our enemies, and therefore to be cheriſhed by every true and loyal ſubject to his Majeſty," he, with his uſual conſiſtency, tells us was baſely yielded to by the Iriſh, contrary to conviction, from the moſt vile motives, and carried by government, by bringing forward the military to over awe parliament.

"It muſt however in truth be admitted, that the nerves of ſeveral of the members in both houſes of parliament were from the ſhock of the late rebellion ſo much weakened, that they unconditionally ſurrendered the exerciſe of any diſcretion upon the ſubject: many of them too readily gave up the prepoſſeſſions and convictions of their whole lives to the momentary lure of advantage holden out to the ſupporters of the meaſure; and ſome, it cannot be denied, baſely ſold what they ſincerely thought to be the intereſt of their country for their private gain."

"Many, it is to be feared, in both houſes ſacrificed their *convictions*." "Under pretence of *ſecuring* the perſons of the members from inſult and outrage, a regular guard of cavalry was mounted in Foſter's Place, near to the Parliament Houſe."

It appears to us a ſtrange mode of reconciling the minds of men to an union, to tell them that it was brought about on one ſide by a direliction of every principle dear to a brave, honourable, and honeſt man, and on the other by military intimidation. Nor do we conceive it to be the part of an impartial hiſtorian, eſpecially of one who would be thought the champion of union, to ſay that the protection of the perſons of the members was a *pretence*, when he knows that many of the members were groſsly inſulted, when he himſelf confeſſes that they were, and when it is notorious that many members went armed to parliament, to defend themſelves againſt the outrages of the populace. The mob of Dublin is certainly not leſs riotous than the mob of London, and the fatal delay of calling in the aid of the military in 1780, is but too well known, and will be long deplored. In the *thing* which Mr. P. with ridiculous affectation terms "a *Poſtliminious* Preface," the ſame ſpirit is abundantly diſplayed. We are there told that "He diſcovered from enquiries, that, ſo far from its (the union) uniting and conſolidating the affections of the Iriſh with thoſe of the Britiſh, a *general diſcontent and diſguſt* at the meaſure ſeemed to pervade all ranks of people throughout that country. (P. 16.) And farther, "he was aſſured by an Iriſh member of the imperial parliament, that

that, though he had ever *execrated the meaſure, he had voted for it uniformly* from its propoſal to its accompliſhment, and that it was, he believed, *cordially deteſted* by 99 out of 100 of his countrymen." (Ib.) What can we ſay of a writer who thus blunders through thick and thin; his aſſumed conciliatory character leading one way, his natural inclinations forcibly dragging him in a contrary direction. Here the veil is far from "impervious"—"*Naturam expellas furcâ, tamen uſque recurret.*" He had told us that the union was ſuch a bleſſing that it ought "to be cheriſhed by every true and loyal ſubject to his Majeſty." If he meant any thing by this ſentiment, he muſt now confeſs that he has impreſſed the brand of *diſloyalty* on the whole Iriſh nation, when he tells us that the meaſure has produced general diſcontent and diſguſt. How far this may be *conciliatory* we leave the public to judge. As to the Iriſh member of the Imperial Parliament who ſo boldly, and ſo *wiſely* informed him that he had uniformly voted for an union which he *execrated*, and which his countrymen cordially *deteſted*, it is well that he has not named him (if ſuch a man exiſt) as we conceive that his ſentiments and conduct thus communicated to the world, would be conſidered by him as no flattering teſtimonials to his character.

Mr. P. ſays that his "work does not contain a ſingle ſentence of *religious* controverſy." He would have ſtepped much out of his way if it had. The preſent queſtion between Proteſtants and Papiſts has nothing to do with the doctrines of the latter which are purely *religious:* but we maintain that the Romiſh Church holds *political* principles, ſanctioned by the higheſt, and what by Papiſts is deemed *infallible* authority, which principles are dangerous to every proteſtant government; and, moreover, that ſhe has acted upon theſe principles whenever it was in her power. This Mr. P. every where denies, and in his voluminous Appendix brings forward a maſs of what he calls evidence in ſupport of his opinion. This evidence conſiſts of the declarations of the Iriſh Papiſts, and of the anſwers of ſome Papiſh Univerſities to the queries which were laid before them, when Mr. Pitt requeſted to be furniſhed with the real political doctrines of the Romiſh Church. It is not ſurpriſing that the Iriſh Papiſts, circumſtanced as they were, ſhould have diſavowed the obnoxious principles, though in doing ſo they ceaſed to adhere to the deciſions of their *infallible* Church; but it is rather ſingular that the Univerſities ſhould have joined in the diſavowal: to this the object in view, (the advantages to be reaped by their Popiſh brethren) no doubt, greatly contributed.

The queries ſent were the following:

1. "Has the pope, or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the church of Rome, any civil authority, power, juriſdiction, or pre-eminence whatſoever, within the realm of England?

2. "Can the pope or cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the church of Rome, abſolve or diſpenſe with his Majeſty's ſubjects, from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatſoever?

3. "Is

3. "Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are juſtified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other perſons differing from them in religious opinions, in any tranſaction, either of a public or a private nature?"

To all theſe queries all the univerſities anſwered decidedly in the negative, declaring that no ſuch doctrines were held by the Church of Rome, and, in effect, ſaying that they *never* had been held, as their Church cannot err. Nay, the Univerſity of Louvain ſpeaks out, and ſays "they *never* had been held."

Before we proceed farther, we muſt juſt obſerve that were the members of the Church of England in ſimilar circumſtances to the Papiſts of Ireland, to ſend their opponents to the Univerſities of Oxford, Cambridge, and Dublin, for an authentic account of the doctrines they hold, would it be deemed ſatisfactory? No, if we ſhrunk from any of the authenticated doctrines of our Church, our adverſaries would (and with juſtice too) appeal from judges ſo inadequate to the fountain head, to the articles of our religion, ſanctioned by legal authority. We have, therefore, a right to appeal from Univerſities who may, or may not have ſpoken their own ſentiments, but who certainly have not avowed the real doctrines of their Church, to the fountain head, to what is deemed by every true Papiſt not only legal, but *infallible* authority, to the teſtimony of GENERAL COUNCILS.

We might accumulate authorities of this kind, but the nature of our publication confines us to a few. Innocent IV. and the *General Council* of Lyons, *depoſed* the Emperor Frederick II. *abſolving* his ſubjects from their *oath* of *fidelity*. The *theopneuſt* fathers of the council, no doubt foreſeeing that this heavenly doctrine would in after, and degenerate times, be denied, put their ſeals to the ſentence of depoſition, to give notoriety to the fact, and that it might be held in everlaſting remembrance. "*In majorem rei confirmationem, et memoriam ſempiternam.*" Spond. Annal. ann. 1245. This overt act, for Mr. P. inſiſts much on overt acts, was in ſtrict conformity to a deciſion of Gregory VII. in a council held at Rome, where it is ſaid, "We, following the ſtatutes of our predeceſſors, do, by our apoſtolic authority, *abſolve* all thoſe from their *oath* of *fidelity* who are bound to *excommunicated perſons*,* either by duty, or *oath*." (Decret. 2da pars cauſ. 15. quæſt. 6.) And Gregory IX. has laid down the general principle with moſt ſcrupulous and commendable preciſion. "Be it known to all who are under the dominion of *heretics*, that they are *ſet free* from every *tie* of *fidelity* and *duty* to them, all *oaths* or *ſolemn agreement* to the contrary notwithſtanding." (Decret. Greg. lib. 1. tit. 7.) Urban II. declares, "That no one is to be deemed a *murderer*, who, burning with zeal for the intereſts of Mother Church, ſhall kill excommunicated perſons." (Decret. 2da. pars, cauſ. 23. quæſt. 5.) And the inſpired council of Sienna, for every council is inſpired, after

* Geo. III. and all heretics are *de jure* excommunicated.

having

having promiſed *indulgences*, and *ſalvation* to the active *exterminators* of the Huſſites, "exhorts, invites, and admoniſhes all princes and lords, both eccleſiaſtical and ſecular, by the bowels of God's mercy, to extirpate the above condemned hereſy, with all ſpeed, if they would avoid the divine vengeance, and the *penalties of the law*, (i. e. excommunication, and the abſolving their ſubjects from the oath of fidelity.") (Acta Concil. Senenſis, apud Richerii Hiſt. conc. tom. II. p. 278, et ſequent.) The 4th council of Lateran gives its ſanction to the ſame humane principle. "Catholics who ſhall take up the croſs, gird up their loins, and be active in *exterminating* heretics, ſhall enjoy the ſame indulgences and privileges with perſons going to the relief of the Holy Land." (Conc. Lat. 4. apud Decret. Greg. lib. 5. tit. 7.) Theſe privileges and indulgences were a *full remiſſion of their ſins*, if they died in the cauſe. (Decret. pars 2. cauſ. 23. quæſt. 5.) The *temporal juriſdiction* of the Church of Rome over kings, emperors, and potentates of every deſcription, is moſt unequivocally aſſerted by the fathers of the Council of Conſtance in the 14th ſeſſion. It is there pronounced, "That if any perſon ſhall preſume to violate the ſtatutes and ordinances of the Holy Council, he ſhall be *deprived* of all *dignities*, *eſtates*, *honours*, *offices*, and *beneſices*, eccleſiaſtical or ſecular, whether he be king, emperor, cardinal, or pope." Let us conclude all by the laſt authentic edition of the Popiſh religion, the council of Trent. Here we find the ſame claim to *temporal* authority aſſerted. "The emperors, kings, princes, dukes, &c. and temporal lords of every denomination, who ſhall aſſign a place in their territories for ſingle combat between Chriſtians, are hereby excommunicated, and *deprived of all juriſdiction and authority* over the town, caſtle, or any other place which holds of the Church, where the duel ſhall be allowed to be fought; and if they be feudal poſſeſſions, they ſhall revert to the ſupreme Lord." (Concil. Trid. Seſſ. 25. cap. 19.)

We conclude this part of our Review with recommending to the ſober reflection of the preſent defender of the political principles and practice of the Church of Rome the following hiſtorical fact. When the Spaniards had ſubjugated the Moors, for the ſafety and protection of the latter, the following clauſe was inſerted in the coronation oath of the Spaniſh monarch. "The king ſhall, on no pretext whatſoever, expel the Moriſcoes, nor force them againſt their wills to be baptiſed; and he ſhall, neither directly nor indirectly, ever deſire to be diſpenſed with as to the ſaid oath: and in caſe a diſpenſation ſhould be offered to him, he ſhall not accept of it: and if he do, whatſoever may be done by him thereupon, ſhall be null and void." The Church of Rome did not reliſh this oath, and Clement VII. granted the following diſpenſation to the Emperor Charles V. "We do releaſe your Majeſty from the obligation of the oath, which we are informed was taken by you in the general eſtates of the ſaid kingdoms, never to expel the ſaid infidels; *abſolving* you from all *cenſures* and *penalties* of the guilt of *perjury*, which you might incur thereby; and *diſpenſing* with you as to that promiſe—all ordinances, ſtatutes, and privileges

of

of the said kingdoms and principalities to the contrary notwithstanding, though confirmed by an oath, or by whatsoever other authority: and notwithstanding it should have been provided that a relaxation from said oath should not be desired, nor ever be made use of, if granted," &c. (Geddes's Tracts, Pp. 36, 39, 40.) Need we say after this that the Moors were expelled? Folly, injustice, and perjury united to deprive of their property, and to banish from their native home 700,000 persons; who, according to the testimony of their inveterate enemy, the Archbishop of Valentia, were *frugal*, *temperate*, *laborious*, and *industrious*. With an imbecillity equal to his bigotry and injustice, he gives this as one of the reasons for their expulsion. "The Moriscoes, being a *laborious* and *industrious* people, do, by working cheaper than the Spaniards are able to work, eat the bread out of the Spaniard's mouths: and also, being very *frugal* and *temperate*, they do contribute very little to the public excises." (Letter of the Archbishop, apud Geddes's Tracts, p. 71.)

Such is the doctrine of the Popish Church, and such has been the practice of her votaries. We do not maintain that *all* Irish Papists hold this doctrine, for we are happy in being able to say that we know some who do not; yet, in this respect they are not Papists indeed: for, in opposition to all the Doctors of all the Universities appealed to, we aver, with the fullest proof and conviction that such is the doctrine of the Church of Rome, hitherto uncontradicted by what is acknowledged by all Papists to be the *infallible* organ of that Church—A GENERAL COUNCIL. Indeed of appealing to foreign Universities, the Irish Papists, all Papists should have used their utmost endeavours to have got the obnoxious tenets expunged from their religious code by the same supreme power which placed them there so execrably conspicuous. They received this advice years ago from a writer who in two Dissertations, in which much learning and ability are displayed, has convicted the Church of Rome of sanctioning the principles we now lay to her charge.

"If these tenets," says he, "in any sense that can reasonably be given them, be not *essential* to popery, (and wo to that religion they are essential to) why do not Roman Catholics with united voice solemnly reprobate them in a General Council of their Church, and consign them to eternal oblivion? Why not make that sacrifice to their own interests, at least in Protestant countries, and to the peace and harmony of the Christian world?" *

The *Postliminious* Preface contains an attempt to answer some of the strictures on the work, and a long detail of the author's manœuvres with Mr. Pitt, as far back as 1792, and afterwards with Mr. Addington, to obtain pecuniary assistance from government. The former

* "Two Dissertations on Popish persecution and breach of faith, by D. Grant, D. D. printed for J. Murray, Fleet-street, 1779."

seems

ſeems to have diſcerned the temper of this writer, and therefore neglected his repeated applications—"he never could obtain an interview." With the latter he was more ſucceſsful, and it was not till after he had been employed, and had received money to carry on the work, that it was diſcovered that he was not the moſt proper perſon in the world to write *conciliatory* hiſtories. We have ſeldom perceived ſtronger marks of mortified ſelf-conſequence than thoſe which Mr. P. exhibits in this detail. Sore at not being received at the Caſtle of Dublin as the ſaviour of Britain and Ireland, there is no end of his indignant complaint. One grievance, as curious, and characteriſtic of the complainant, we will notice. It is made a crime, at leaſt a high breach of decorum in Mr. Abbot, who was then Iriſh ſecretary, to have received a perſonage of his conſequence *in boots!* "Mr. Secretary was on his legs, booted and ſpurred." Were he now to have an interview with the ſame perſon, peradventure he might inſiſt that the Speaker's wig and robes ſhould make part of the ceremony. When he had completed his work, and found that it was not approved of, his mortified feelings ſeem to have been worked up to the higheſt inflammatory ſtate; ſo great, indeed, appears to have been the degree of irritation, as to have led him, like perſons in a delirium, to ſee and feel things which did not really exiſt. e. g. Speaking of a letter he had received from the miniſter, he ſays, "Inſtantly the letter was ſnatched violently out of the author's hand, from behind, by Mr. Hiley Addington, and committed to the flames." This aſſertion we have *authority* moſt peremptorily to contradict.

Before we have done with this *poſtſcript* preface, we ſhall take notice of one of Mr. P.'s attempts to repel the ſtrictures on his work, as a ſufficient ſpecimen of his abilities and ſucceſs. He had been accuſed of interdicting any reference to Clarendon, and other hiſtorians, who did not ſuit his purpoſe, and of accuſing the Proteſtants with having commenced the firſt maſſacre in 1641, contrary to the faith of hiſtory. His interdicting the authority of Clarendon is here a *general* and a *true* charge, and is *not* brought againſt him with reſpect to the maſſacre of iſland Magee, for the authors of the ſtrictures knew, and have ſaid that Lord C. was "betrayed into the ſame abſurdity." This Mr. P. knew, but it was not convenient for him to confeſs it. Inſtead of which, having inſerted the quotation from Clarendon, he triumphantly exclaims, "Let any man of common honour or honeſty (I appeal to none other) ſay, is this interdicting the authority of Lord C.?" No, no one ever ſaid it was: but, by inſerting it in your work as truth, it is writing contrary to the faith of hiſtory. This anſwerer goes on in the ſame triumphant ſtrain. "Is this Mr. P.'s or Lord C.'s accuſation?" It is the accuſation of both—Clarendon is the original parent of the brat, and Mr. Plowden the adopting and cheriſhing father. Had the latter, when at Dublin, given himſelf the trouble of examining the MS depoſitions of the county of Antrim, referred to by Leland, we incline to think that he would have been better employed

ployed than in gazing on the Miletian "viſions of glory," or in collecting inflammatory pamphlets.

Our readers we are afraid will accuſe us of having dwelt too long on this publication. Perhaps we have; but, however deſpicable it may be as a literary production, we thought that the principles it contained required, in the preſent ſtate of things, more attention than its literary merits deſerved. The meaneſt inſect, with the feebleſt ſting, may, in certain prediſpoſitions of the body, produce inflammations, and in this reſpect the body politic too much reſembles the natural body. We will not ſay a word of the *manner* in which the *matter* has been conveyed, more than that we think it a heavy, dull, and incorrect compilation, wire-drawn with every art of book-making beyond all bounds. The compiler, as was to be expected, is of a very different opinion, and boaſts that he has complied with the maxim of Cicero, which he quotes, "*nihil eſt in hiſtoriâ purâ et illuſtri* BREVITATE *dulcius.*" We can only ſay of his *brevity* that it is the moſt intolerable *prolixity* which, as Reviewers, we have ever met with.

As to both the *matter* and *manner* of the work, we fancy that ſenſible and well-informed Roman Catholics will be tempted to diſmiſs their preſent advocate with "*adverſario da iſtum patronum :*"

After we had written this review of Mr. PLOWDEN's books, we received, ſome very able ſtrictures and comments on them, and on the ſubject connected therewith, from a correſpondent, whoſe knowledge and information reſpecting the Hiſtory and actual State of Ireland, qualify him, in a peculiar degree, for diſcuſſions of a ſimilar nature. Thinking thoſe ſtrictures too valuable to be loſt, we have determined to ſubjoin them to our own remarks, that our readers may have a regular and connected view of the ſubject, which is certainly one of great importance.

Important Conſiderations on the late and preſent State of Ireland, in curſory Remarks on Mr. Francis Plowden's Miſcellaneous Work, and in Strictures on his Poſtliminious Preface, and on ſome Writers whom he has quoted.

MR. Francis Plowden, a popiſh conveyancer of the Middle Temple, publiſhed, in the beginning of the year 1803, a voluminous work in three volumes quarto, entitled, "An Hiſtorical Review of the State of Ireland, from the Invaſion of that Country, under Henry II. to the union with Great Britain, on the 1ſt day of June 1801." The main object of the author is to prove, that popery is as productive of loyalty and ſocial harmony, under a proteſtant ſtate, as the eſtabliſhed religion; and, for that purpoſe, he endeavours to convince the reader, that the various rebellions which have diſgraced and agitated Ireland for near three centuries, have been occaſioned by the tyranny, the impolitic, the cruel and barbarous conduct of the Engliſh government towards the natives of Ireland, and that religious bigotry had little or no ſhare in producing them. Any perſon who has had but a ſuperficial view of the Iriſh Annals, muſt perceive, that Mr. Plowden, in order to accompliſh this object, has been guilty of the groſſeſt perverſions of hiſtoric truth, by endeavouring to eſtabliſh the veracity of Iriſh annaliſts, whoſe well known partiality, ariſing from diſaffection, had

long

long ſince conſigned them to oblivion, and by attempting to bring into diſrepute a great number of judicious and candid writers, whoſe credit has been long eſtabliſhed by uninterrupted and univerſal approbation.

I ſhall not take upon me to criticiſe that voluminous work, as it has been very ably done in "Strictures upon an Hiſtorical Review of the State of Ireland, by Francis Plowden, Eſq. or a Juſtification of the Conduct of the Engliſh Governments in that Country," printed for Meſſrs. Rivington, London, in which the author has completely ſucceeded in detecting and expoſing the inſidious attempts of Mr. P. to arraign the wiſdom, the juſtice and humanity of the Britiſh government; and in doing this, he has diſplayed ſo profound a knowledge of the Engliſh and Iriſh hiſtory, ſo ſolid a judgment, and ſuch accuracy of diſcrimination, joined to great elegance of ſtyle, that this very excellent work muſt be conſidered as a valuable addition to the libraries of perſons of taſte and rational curioſity.

Many popiſh writers have had the folly and malignity to palliate, nay to juſtify, the rebellions which have afflicted Ireland, for above 200 years, on the ſcore of tyranny and cruelty practiſed by government, and in doing ſo, they have been guilty of the groſſeſt falſhoods, and the moſt monſtrous prevarications. Mr. Plowden has not only endeavoured to vindicate the authenticity of ſuch ſcribblers, but has followed their example in *striving "to make the worse appear the better reason;"* but the ſize and dulneſs of his work, in which it reſembles its author, will, in a great meaſure, defeat his evil deſigns; for, like leaden coin, which is bulky and ponderous, without any intrinſic value, it will not go much into circulation.

> "In his great bulk a ton of man is writ,
> Yet he is but a kilderkin of wit." DRYDEN.

It muſt appear ſingular to the reader that he ſhould endeavour to excuſe the crime of treaſon by ſanctioning the calumnious accuſations of the diſaffected againſt the government of his native country; and at a time, too, that popiſh treaſon was ſo ſtrongly fermenting in Ireland, and in the city of Dublin in particular, that a ſtrong garriſon of the military, and a numerous body of yeomanry, are deemed neceſſary for its preſervation; and the ſudden inſurrection, and the woeful events which occurred on the 23d of July, 1803, unqueſtionably prove, that the apprehenſions of government on this point are not imaginary. Thoſe who are acquainted with Mr. Plowden's education, and with the ſtrong indications of narrow popiſh bigotry which he has given in various publications, will not be ſurpriſed at the hoſtile diſpoſitions which he has manifeſted againſt the proteſtant ſtate.

He was bred at the popiſh ſeminary of St. Omers, where many Engliſh prieſts imbibed ſuch religious tenets in Elizabeth's reign, as led them to enter into treaſonable combinations againſt the ſtate, and aſſaſſination plots againſt the life of that Princeſs, becauſe ſhe was a Heretick; of whom the reader will find an account in a trial, entitled "A brief hiſtorical Account of the Behaviour of the Jeſuits and their Faction, for the firſt twenty-five Years of Elizabeth's Reign," and in another entitled, "The Execution of Juſtice in England, not for Religion but for Treaſon." The laſt was publiſhed by the deſire of Lord Burleigh. At this Univerſity, it is to be preſumed, that he did not receive any leſſons of loyalty to a Proteſtant ſtate; but that, on the contrary, he was dyed in grain in thoſe ſingular and dangerous doctrines, which I ſhall hereafter quote in his works; and that there he was well

Supply'd

" Supply'd with ſpiritual proviſion,
And magazines of ammunition,
With croſſes, relics, crucifixes,
Beads, pictures, rotaries and pixes,
The tools of working out ſalvation,
By mere mechanic operation." HUDIBRAS.

In ſhort, the reader may infer from former publications of this popiſh drawcanſir, as well as from his Hiſtorical Review, that his mind is ſo clouded with bigotry, and inflamed by fanaticiſm, that he may ſay to his holy father the Pope, " The zeal of thy houſe hath eaten me up."

Some years ſince, he publiſhed in London, a work entitled " Jura Anglorum," " The Rights of Engliſhmen," in which the reader expects to find our very excellent conſtitution delineated, defended, and panegyriſed; but how great muſt his ſurpriſe be, when he diſcovers, that the principal article in it is a defence of the Pope's ſupremacy over the Britiſh nation; and that the emancipation of our Church from the inſatiable avarice and ambition of the Roman Pontiffs, which had occaſioned unutterable calamities in England, is treated by him as an uſurpation.

He ſays, " ſo true is it, that they had uninterruptedly acknowledged and ſubmitted to it, for near a thouſand years, before the 24th of Henry VIII. A. D. 1532. It is frivolous in the extreme to treat this ſpiritual ſupremacy of the Pope as a papal uſurpation."

He treats Sir Edward Coke with much ſeverity, mingled with contempt, for having vindicated the independence of the Engliſh Church, againſt papal encroachments, which he has done with great ability in various parts of his Inſtitutes; but particularly in a treatiſe, in his fifth report, entitled, " De Jure Regis Eccleſiaſtico." " On the King's Eccleſiaſtical Rights."

From the oſtentatious diſplay which this champion of popery has made, in various works, of his profound knowledge in eccleſiaſtical hiſtory, and in the general councils and canons of the Romiſh Church, which he defends and maintains, we may conclude that he is—

" In ſchool divinity as able,
As he that hight irrefragable;
A ſecond Thomas, or at once,
To name them all another Duns *;
Profound in all the nominal
And real ways beyond them all;
For he a rope of ſand could twiſt,
As tough as learned Sorbonniſt."

Mr. Plowden then cannot but know, that papal ſupremacy is a groſs impoſture, dictated by the avarice and ambition of the Roman Pontiffs: that it was founded in a conſpiracy againſt the reaſon and liberty of mankind, during an age of midnight ignorance; and that ſome of the moſt reſpectable Popes condemned and renounced it.

When the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, on the cloſe of the ſixth Century, aſſumed the title of General or ſupreme Biſhop, Pope Gregory I. in a letter

* Johannes Dunſcotus, a learned divine, who lived in the 13th century. In ſome editions of Hudibras, it was Dunce, the reader is at liberty to adopt which ever he chuſes. Utrum horum mavis accipe.

to the Emperor Mauritius, declared, "That it was a blaſphemous title; and that none of the Roman Pontiffs ever dared to aſſume ſo ſingular a one*." And in a letter to the Patriarch he ſaid, "What wilt thou ſay to Chriſt, the head of the Univerſal Church, who thus endeavoureſt to ſubject his members to thyſelf, by this title of univerſal? Who, I aſk thee, doſt thou imitate in this, but the Devil†? In a letter to the Empreſs Conſtantia, he ſays, "His pride in aſſuming this title, ſhewed that the days of Anti-Chriſt were at hand‡."

What opinion muſt the reader entertain of the heart and underſtanding of a man, who would ſubject the Britiſh Empire to a tyranny, founded in groſs ſuperſtition, unfavourable to civil liberty and pure religion, and which long proved fatal to the peace and proſperity of his native country; to which his religious creed, obviouſly, makes him an alien? "Woe unto them that call evil good, and good evil, that put darkneſs for light and light for darkneſs." —ISAIAH.

Is that man worthy to enjoy the rights of Engliſhmen, who reflects on that bright æra, the reformation, the real ſource of England's greatneſs and glory?

——————"Sic Etruria crevit,
"Scilicet et rerum facta eſt pulcherrima Roma."

What opinion muſt we entertain of Mr. P., who endeavours, in his voluminous work, "The Hiſtorical Review," to vilify and criminate the loyal Proteſtants of Ireland, who fought bravely, and bled profuſely in defence of the conſtitution, in 1798; and to juſtify the enormities and the butcheries of the Iriſh rebels, who united with, and ſolicited the aſſiſtance of, the French infidels, to ſubvert the conſtitution, and to deſtroy the Empire, by ſeparating their native country from England? What conception muſt the reader form of a man who defends, in the ſame work, the treaſonable and ſanguinary conduct of the Iriſh Papiſts, in the rebellion of 1641, by ſaying, that "the moſt ſerious apprehenſions were entertained of an immediate and general maſſacre or extermination of the Catholics;" and that "they united in a regular ſyſtem of *self-defence*, which, to this day," he ſays, "is moſt unwarrantably and unjuſtly ſtyled an odious and unnatural rebellion."

As Mr. Hume's hiſtory is acceſſible to every Engliſh reader, I ſhall refer him to his exact and authentic delineation of the profound diſſimulation with which the conſpiracy which preceded that rebellion was carried on, and how ſudden, and unexpected by the Proteſtants the inſurrection was.

But Hugh Oge M'Mahon, one of the leaders, confeſſed, "that all the Lords and Gentlemen in the kingdom that were Papiſts, were engaged in the plot; and that the Iriſh had prepared men in all parts of the kingdom, to deſtroy all the Engliſh and Proteſtants in one night." Lord M'Guire, a great rebel chieftain, acknowledged "that the deſign was formed ſo early as the year 1628, when a negotiation with Cardinal Richelieu for aſſiſtance had been carried on; and that application had been made to the Pope, the Kings of France and Spain for that purpoſe. Even M'Mahon, a popiſh prieſt, and afterwards titular biſhop of Raphoe, declared, that he had been employed, in the year 1634, to ſolicit the aſſiſtance of theſe powers, to promote that rebellion.

---

* Gregory, Epiſtles, lib. 4. ind. 13. p. 137.
† Ibid. Epiſtle 38. ‡ Ibid. Epiſt. 34.

What opinion muſt the reader entertain of the judgment and ſagacity of Mr. Plowden, as an hiſtorian, when he tells us in Volume I. and page 9, of his ponderous work, "That *purity of blood* (among the Iriſh) became a national object, and carried with it more real conſequence, than it did in any other nation in Europe;" and yet, in page 13, of the ſame volume, he ſays, "when any one died, all the poſſeſſions, real and perſonal, of the whole family were put together (or in hotch pot), and divided anew; and that *baſtard ſons* were admitted into this diſtribution." He farther ſays, "the diviſion extended to the whole ſept or race, by which means many veſted freeholds came upon ſuch new partitions to be diveſted, during the lives of the tenants."

Mr. Plowden admits, that "this law or cuſtom of gavelkind was productive of one of the moſt pernicious prejudices, that can pervade the uſeful part of a community," as he ſays that "it prevented whole ſepts or families, howſoever numerous, from learning any trade, or turning mechanics, becauſe they would be thus degraded, and the cauſinny* would in any future diviſion exclude ſuch as had *debaſed themſelves* by *ſuch abdication of their family dignity*."

Mr. Plowden may annex ſome ſecret meaning to the word *dignity*, which I am at a loſs to know; but I am ſure the reader will agree with me, that laws encouraging ſloth and idleneſs, and a total rejection of uſeful induſtry, muſt inevitably tend, inſtead of dignifying, to render the human ſpecies extremely barbarous.

Sir John Davis, whoſe accuracy and veracity Mr. Plowden appreciates in a high degree, and quotes often, ſpeaks thus of it in his hiſtorical relations.

"That cuſtom of gavelkind, did breed another miſchief; for thereby every man being born to land, as well *baſtard* as legitimate, they all held themſelves to be gentlemen; and though their portions were never ſo ſmall, and themſelves never ſo poor (for gavelkind muſt make a poor gentility), they did ſcorn to deſcend to huſbandry or merchandize, or to learn any mechanic art or ſcience; and this is the true cauſe why there never were any corporate towns erected in the Iriſh countries."

He adds, "theſe poor gentlemen were ſo affected to their ſmall portions of land, as they choſe rather to live at home by *theft* †, extortion, or coſhering, than to ſeek any better fortune abroad."

Thus much will be ſufficient to ſhew the reader the ſtate of property among the middling and lower claſſes of the people; and Sir John Davis thus explains taniſtry, which regulated, and operated upon the property of the chieftains.

"But by the Iriſh cuſtom of taniſtry, the chieftains of every country, and the chief of every ſept, had no longer any eſtate than *for life* in their chiefries, the inheritance whereof, did reſt in no man. And theſe chiefries, though they had ſome portions of land alloted unto them, did conſiſt chiefly in *cuttings and coſherings, and other Iriſh exactions, whereby they did ſpoil and impoveriſh the people at pleaſure*. And when their chieftains were dead, their

---

* Sir John Davis tells us, that he as the head of the ſept, divided the lands according to his diſcretion on the death of any one of them.

† We learn from Mr. Plowden that they did not loſe their dignity by *thieving*, though they did ſo by uſeful induſtry.

ſons,

ſons, or next heirs, did not ſucceed them, but their taniſts, who were elective, and purchaſed their eſtates *by strong hand.*"

Sir John Davis, after ſtating "the cauſes of the common miſery of the kingdom," adds, "*I omit the common repudiation of their wives, their promiscuous generation of children, their neglect of lawful matrimony, their uncleanness in apparel, diet, and lodging, and their scorn of all things necessary for the civil life of man.*"

Thus it appears, that the Brehon laws of the Iriſh, which were immemorially eſtabliſhed amongſt them, muſt have kept them in a ſtate of the utmoſt barbariſm; and that they were totally ignorant of thoſe ſimple inſtitutions, which the earlieſt civilizers of mankind conſidered as the firſt and incipient ſteps towards civilization, viz. the ſecurity of property, and its tranſfer or tranſmiſſion in a regular line of ſucceſſion, a reſpect for religion, a prevention of promiſcuous generation, building towns, forming communities, and the eſtabliſhment of fixed laws

Fuit hæc ſapientia quondam,
Publica privatis ſecernere, ſacra profanis;
Concubitu prohibere vago, dare jura maritis,
Oppida moliri, leges incidere ligno. HORACE.

In ſhort, we are told by Strabo, Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, and every ancient and modern writer, reſpected for his veracity, that there appeared nothing in the Iriſh character, but traits of barbariſm and invincible ferocity, which every perſon, verſed in the ſcience of civil polity, will perceive muſt have been a neceſſary conſequence of the operation of their Brehon laws; and the reader will find a clear and comprehenſive view of theſe laws, in the antiquities of Ireland, recently publiſhed in Dublin.

After theſe unequivocal proofs of the barbarous ſtate of the Iriſh, which Mr. Plowden in a great meaſure admits, he is guilty of ſuch groſs inconſiſtency, as to give the following exaggerated deſcription of their civilization and refinement, in page 12.

"The pretenſions to the royal ſtock of ſovereignty in Ireland, were not the only grounds of this ſyſtem of family pride and conſequent preſumption. Each King or Sovereign had his order of Chivalry, of which himſelf was the chief, his High Prieſt to ſuperintend Religion, his Brehon, or Chief Juſtice to expound the law, his phyſicians, antiquarians, chief treaſurer, marſhal, ſtandard bearer, generals of horſe and foot, &c. &c." "All theſe were hereditary honours, in certain families, out of which the moſt diſtinguiſhed and beſt qualified were elected to the particular appointment."

From page 15 to 23, he gives an account of the Convention of the States in Parliament, in which he tells us, the Druids and other learned men repreſented the people; of the ſumptuouſneſs of their feaſts, which laſted ſix days ſucceſſively, of their heraldry, of their ſhields or targets, diſtinguiſhed by their coats of arms, emblazoned on them; and he informs us, that large and ample revenues were aſſigned to their public heralds, phyſicians, harpers and bards.

Mr. P. well knowing that no records whatſoever exiſt, to authenticate his fabulous deſcription of the ancient ſplendour and proſperity of the Iriſh, he tells us, in page 16, that the Danes in their frequent ravages and invaſions of Ireland, burnt all their books and monuments of antiquity that fell in their way.

In a note in page 15, he informs us, that this highly poliſhed ſtate of the Iriſh nation, "their regular ſyſtem of heraldry, and their literary inſtitutions,

exiſted nine hundred and fifty years before the æra alluded to by Cæſar, of the rude barbariſm of the Britains," and conſequently one thouſand years before the birth of our Saviour.

In ſhort, we find through the whole of his work, a diſpoſition to exalt the Iriſh, becauſe a numerous portion of them are the moſt bigotted Papiſts in Europe; and to diſparage the Engliſh nation, becauſe the moſt of them are attached to the reformed religion; and that the ſtate is founded in it, and his inconſiſtency is ſuch, that though he has declared, that the main object of his Hiſtorical Review is to allay religious acrimony, to reconcile the Iriſh people to an incorporate union, and to attach them to England, he frequently reminds them, that this degradation from their viſionary greatneſs, aroſe from a connection with Great Britain: thus, in page 20, he ſays, "this ſtate of pre-eminence, which Ireland ſo long enjoyed, amidſt the nations of Europe, ſhews to what a degree of conſequence ſhe is capable of riſing, when her native energies and powers are not cramped by internal diviſions, or *damped by foreign oppreſſion or rigour.*" In page 205, he tells them, "that it has been the fate of their country, *to experience more harſhneſs from the Engliſh government than any other part of the Empire.*" In page 263, after ſtating various irritating topics, he laments that "Engliſh intereſt" had great influence in the government of Ireland, and he repeatedly complains of "Engliſh intereſt and aſcendancy." This was conſtantly the cant of the United Iriſhmen. On their firſt meeting in Dublin, for on the 9th of November 1791, they ſtate in their declaration, "we are ruled by Engliſhmen, and the ſervants of Engliſhmen, whoſe object is the intereſt of another country, whoſe intereſt is corruption whoſe ſtrength is the weakneſs of Ireland." "Reſolved, that the weight of Engliſh influence in the government of this country is ſo great, as to require a cordial union among the people of Ireland."

When Theobald Wolfe Tone, agent to the Catholic Committee, ſent certain reſolutions to Belfaſt, to be adopted by the Republicans and Anarchiſts who aſſembled there, on the 19th of July 1792, from all parts of the kingdom, to celebrate the French Revolution, he ſaid in his letter, the main object of the reſolutions is, "a complete internal union of all the people in Ireland, and to reſiſt the weight of Engliſh influence." "My unalterable opinion is, that the bane of Iriſh proſperity, is in the influence of England. I believe that influence will be extended, while the connection between the two countries continues." "I have not ſaid one word that looks like a wiſh for ſeparation *; though I give it to you as my decided opinion, that ſuch an event would be regeneration to this country †."

Richard Talbot, created Earl, and afterwards Duke of Tirconnel, and appointed Viceroy of Ireland by James II. in conſideration of his intemperate zeal to promote popery on the ruins of the eſtabliſhed religion, was employed as a ſpy by that monarch, on the conduct of Lord Clarendon, while Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and we ſhall find, in various parts of the latter's State Letters, that Tirconnel uſed frequently to inveigh againſt the act of ſettle-

---

* This proves that the Proteſtant or Engliſh intereſt, which are one and the ſame, are the only bond of union between the two iſlands.

† Report of the Secret Committee of the Houſe of Commons, preſented in 1798, Appendix II.

ment

ment, and what he called *English interest and influence*, by which he meant (as his conduct afterwards proved) a ſeparation from Great Britain. In a letter of June the 8th, 1686, the reader will find that he ſaid to the Viceroy, in that vulgar ſtrain in which he uſually expreſſed himſelf "By G—d, my Lord, theſe acts of ſettlements, and this new intereſt (meaning the Engliſh), are damned things." In a letter of Auguſt the 3d. 1686, ſtrong fears are expreſſed, that Tirconnel and his party, had a deſign of undoing *the English interest*. This furious fanatic, who had full as much bigotry as Mr. Plowden, was, with his brother, the titular Archbiſhop of Dublin, deeply involved in a popiſh plot againſt the ſtate, in 1677, which was connected with one in England, for the purpoſe of extirpating the Proteſtant Religion, with the aſſiſtance of a French army, to be ſupplied by Louis XIV *. to whom Tirconnel was agent. For this, he, his brother, and ſome of the Papiſt nobility and gentry were impriſoned, and others fled †.

It is well known that the Engliſh and Proteſtant intereſts are inſeparably connected; that they are the only bond of union between the two kingdoms; and there cannot be a ſtronger indication of deep rooted diſaffection to the conſtitution, than an attempt to condemn or depreciate it.

Talbot or Tirconnel, a member of James the Second's popiſh parliament, in 1686, was an active inſtrument in forwarding bills for repealing the act of ſettlement, for attainting all the proteſtant landholders of Ireland, and making Ireland independent of England. While commander in chief, during the viceroyſhip of Lord Clarendon, he diſmiſſed all Proteſtants from the army, and recruited it with Papiſts, excluſively.

The main object of Mr. Plowden's voluminous review, is to prove that the Engliſh government ſtrove inceſſantly, from the reign of Henry II. to keep the Iriſh in a ſtate of degradation, and to prevent them from attaining any degree of civilization, by the moſt wanton cruelty and oppreſſion. An extraordinary method of reconciling them to an incorporate union; and yet he profeſſes that it is the ſole deſign of his work; for, in page 22, Vol. I. of his Review, he ſays, "what but union with Great Britain could ſo effectually withdraw the checks and obſtacles thrown in the way of Iriſh greatneſs, and effectually ſtimulate that people to emulate their priſtine glory."

Now this priſtine glory, according to Mr. Plowden, ſhe enjoyed while an independent monarchy, and ſeparated from England, and now it is to be reſtored by her becoming a member of the Britiſh empire.

I ſhall now contraſt the opinion and principles of an Iriſh Proteſtant, on this ſubject, with that of an Engliſh Papiſt.

Sir Richard Muſgrave, in condemning the "Preſs," and "The Union Star," publiſhed in 1797, and 1798, to promote the rebellion, expreſſes himſelf thus:

"One of the main deſigns of theſe infamous prints was, to paint England in the blackeſt colours; to viliſy her conſtitution, as founded on deſpotiſm, and to repreſent her people as knaviſh, artful, and tyrannical; an extraordinary return to that glorious nation, for having given to the ſavages of Ire-

---

* In the ſame manner the Iriſh Papiſts have in our time invited the French Infidels to aſſiſt them with an army againſt England.

† Secret conſults, &c. in State Truths, Vol. III. page 626. Coleman the Jeſuit, who went from England to Ireland to foment the conſpiracy, was afterwards hanged.

land her conſtitution, as far as a kingdom, in her ſubordinate ſtate, could participate of it, for having attempted to reclaim her from downright ſavagery, and for having introduced among them every art that can adorn and improve civil life. Their invectives againſt England were uttered to encourage a ſeparation from her."

The reader may form ſome idea of Mr. Plowden's principles, and how much his mind is imbued with popiſh bigotry, from the following paſſage contained in his caſe ſtated, publiſhed by him in London, in the year 1791, "That the Roman Catholics admit the decrees of a general council in matters of faith and morality, when approved of by the Pope, and received by the church, to *be abſolutely infallible*, and not liable *to deceit or error*."

Now, by various General Councils, and by the Canons framed under them, but particularly by the 4th of Lateran, which is ſanctioned and confirmed by the Council of Trent, the ſectaries of the Romiſh Church are required to depoſe and murder heretical princes, and to extirpate heretics of every kind, for which they are promiſed eternal ſalvation. They are told that no faith is to be kept with heretics; that a true Roman Catholic cannot bear fidelity to a ſovereign of that deſcription, nor a wife to a huſband, nor a ſervant to a maſter. Thus the bonds of ſociety are diſſolved by theſe execrable doctrines, which this impudent popiſh bigot tells us, are *infallible in point of faith and morality, and not liable to deceit or error*.

The loyal ſubjects of Ireland have long experienced the fatal effects of theſe abominable tenets, in treaſonable combinations, inſurrections and maſſacres, perpetrated by the Romaniſts, which laid every Proteſtant ſtate in Europe (not excepting the republic of Holland) under a neceſſity of excluding them from every ſhare of political power. We find that the deleterious principles of the Romiſh Church, which long agitated Europe, and which for many years diſturbed and diſgraced Ireland, have kindled the flames of combuſtion in Botany Bay, whither ſome of the Iriſh rebels * have been tranſported; and in America, where the United Iriſhmen have formed treaſonable plots, which have been minutely and accurately delineated by Mr. William Cobbett, in a tract entitled, "Detection of a Conſpiracy, formed by the United Iriſhmen, with the evident intention of aiding the Tyrants of France, in ſubverting the Government of the United States of America."

What opinion then muſt we have of Mr. Plowden's intellects, when he gravely ſays, in page 42 of his caſe ſtated, "As I have undertaken to ſhew, that the Roman Catholic religion teaches no one point of doctrine, that does not greatly tend to render its followers loyal, dutiful, and peaceable ſubjects, I ſhall be guilty of a very capital and material omiſſion, if I did not alſo ſhew, that it teaches no one point of doctrine, which diſcourages, damps, or ſtifles that principle of love and charity, which is the bond of union, and ſoul of ſocial life."

Though in this tract, which I have quoted, his main and profeſſed object was to obtain a repeal of the penal laws againſt the Engliſh Papiſts, by extolling their religious and moral principles, he ſays, in page 17, "If any one ſays, or pretends to inſinuate, that the modern Roman Catholics (who are the objects of the late bounty of Parliament) differ in one iota from their

---

* Father Harold, pariſh prieſt of Rathcoole was the moſt active promoter of it; he was a leader of rebellion in 1798, and was tranſported to Botany Bay.

predeceſſors,

predeceſſors, he is either deceived himſelf, or he wiſhes to deceive others. "Semper eadem" is more emphatically deſcriptive of our religion, than of our juriſprudence."

Could he injure the intereſts of his fellow religioniſts more materially, than by declaring that they profeſs at this time thoſe abominable principles which often incited them to rebel againſt the Proteſtant ſtate, in the 16th and 17th centuries? Does he not virtually by this pronounce a moſt ſevere ſatire upon the wiſdom, juſtice, and humanity of the Britiſh legiſlature, for having wantonly and unneceſſarily, as he inſinuates, enacted penal laws againſt them.

From ſuch ſpecimens of Mr. Plowden's ſagacity, candour, and conſiſtency, the reader may at once judge how far he will be *edified* and entertained by his vapid and ponderous "Review of the State of Ireland."

"All arguments in his dull work perſuade,
That for anointed dulneſs he was made;
With whate'er gall he ſets himſelf to write,
His inoffenſive libels never bite;
In his fanatic heart tho' venom lies,
It touches but his popiſh pen and dies." DRYDEN.

In refutation of the groſs calumny which Mr. Plowden utters, "that Ireland has experienced more harſhneſs than any other part of the empire, from the Britiſh Government," it will be ſufficient to ſtate, that as the deleterious principles of popery, and that degree of treaſon which is ever inſeparable from it, endangered in England the very exiſtence of the conſtitution, in the 16th and 17th centuries, ſevere penal laws were enacted for its preſervation, ſo early as the reign of Elizabeth, againſt whoſe life many aſſaſſination plots were formed by popiſh prieſts and their fanatical ſectaries.

But the penal laws againſt the Iriſh Papiſts were not enacted till after the Revolution, and only a few of them till the reigns of Ann and George I.; though they had manifeſted the moſt decided and virulent hoſtility to the Proteſtant ſtate, for 150 years before, by forming treaſonable combinations, cemented by oaths, by inſurrections and rebellions, and by repeated invitations, in every reign during that period, to foreign nations, to invade and to aſſiſt them in ſeparating their native country from England *.

Thus, inſtead of harſhneſs, it appears that Ireland experienced ſingular mildneſs and lenity from the Britiſh Government. The reſtrictive laws in England almoſt extinguiſhed the popiſh religion; and had they not been repealed in Ireland, they would ere now have produced the ſame effect. The Britiſh Cabinet were led to believe, that the enlargement of the human mind, by the advancement of ſcience, and the improvement of reaſon, had done away the baneful effects of popery among the Iriſh, but the treaſonable fermentations which have diſgraced and afflicted Ireland, ever ſince the repeal of the penal laws, and which are exactly ſimilar to thoſe which agitated it before their enactment, in the 16th and 17th centuries, evince, that they have been led into a fatal error; and prove what Mr. Plowden ſays, "*that the modern Roman Catholics do not differ in one iota from their predeceſſors;*

* The penal laws paſſed in Ireland were by no means as ſevere as thoſe acted in England.

and that semper eadem is more emphatically descriptive of their religion than of their jurisprudence."

In page 19 and 20 of his Hiſtorical Review, Mr. Plowden ſays, "But it is material to know, that the faith which was preached by St. Patrick to, and received by the Iriſh, was that which is now denominated the Roman Catholic faith. It could have been, in fact, no other, for St. Patrick received his Chriſtian education, as well as his firname Patricius, at Rome, nor is it to be preſumed, that Pope Celeſtine ſent St. Patrick to preach other doctrines than what he himſelf maintained."

The ſuppoſed arrival of St. Patrick in Ireland is univerſally agreed to be about the beginning of the 5th century, long before the popiſh ſuperſtitions were invented, ſuch as the invocation of ſaints, uſing the Scripture and prayers in an unknown tongue, the infallibility of General Councils, the worſhip paid to reliques and images, purgatory, indulgences, adoration of the hoſt, tranſubſtantiation, auricular confeſſion, the adoration of the maſs, ſupererogation, celibacy of the clergy, and the papal ſupremacy.

None of theſe abſurd tenets were entertained, or even thought of, by the four firſt General Councils, viz. Nice, anno domini 325, Conſtantinople, A. D. 381, Epheſus, A. D. 431, Chalcedon, A. D. 451; and by the 28th canon of the latter, it was reſolved, that the ſame rights and honours which had been conferred on the Biſhops of Rome, were due to the Biſhop of Conſtantinople, on account of the equal dignity and luſtre of the two cities, in which theſe prelates exerciſed their authority, which does away the ſupremacy; and the Letters of Gregory I. which I quoted, arraigning the arrogance of the patriarch of Conſtantinople, for daring to aſſume it, one hundred and fifty years after the ſeſſion of that council, muſt convince the reader, that it had no exiſtence at that period. The members of the reformed churches admit and recognize all the tenets maintained by the four firſt General Councils, and the laſt of them was held ſome years ſubſequent to the ſuppoſed arrival of St. Patrick in Ireland *.

The illuſtrious Archbiſhop Uſher, in his learned Treatiſe on the Religion of the Ancient Iriſh, clearly proves, that the doctrines taught by the firſt Chriſtian miſſionaries in Ireland, were free from the erroneous novelties of the Romiſh Church; and how could it be otherwiſe, when they were fabricated at a much later period?

What opinion muſt the reader entertain then of this popiſh bigot, when he tells us, "that the faith which was preached by St. Patrick to, and received by the Iriſh, was that which is now denominated the Roman Catholic faith."

In the ſame manner, he endeavours to miſlead the reader, when he tells him in his Jura Anglorum, page 85, "that St. Auguſtine converted the Engliſh Saxons to chriſtianity, about the year 600, having been ſent by Pope Gregory I. on that miſſion, which is univerſally admitted; but with his uſual diſingenuouſneſs he adds, "from this time then, until the reformation, the majority of this community adopted the Roman Catholic religion, and made it the eſtabliſhed religion of the country."

Through the whole of this beſotted bigot's works, there appears an in-

---

* In the Origines Britannicæ of Stillingfleet, the reader will find it incontrovertibly proved, that moſt of what is ſaid of St. Patrick is fabulous.

temperate

temperate zeal to prove the ſuperiority of the popiſh ſuperſtition over the pure and evangelical creed of the eſtabliſhed church, and that the inhabitants of England had for a thouſand years quietly ſubmitted to, and recognized the ſupremacy of the Roman Pontiffs; though it ſhould be a matter of pride and glory to every loyal ſubject, that the Saxons and Romans made a moſt ſpirited reſiſtance to the arrogant and inſolent claims of the Roman pontiffs; but the prieſts, by their irreſiſtible powers of faſcination on the minds of the multitude, inliſted them under the papal banners, and made them rebels to their liege ſovereign, in conſequence of which King John was obliged to reſign his crown to the pope, and to become his feudatory *.

We cannot be ſurprized that the ſame cauſes produce the ſame effects in our times, and that an attempt has been made in Ireland, to deprive our gracious monarch of his throne, with the aſſiſtance of the French; when Dr. Troy, the preſent titular archbiſhop of Dublin, in his Paſtoral Letter, and Lord Fingal, in his Letter to Lord Redeſdale, tell us, *that the principles of Roman Catholics are the same at all times and in all places.*

Mr. Lock, who firſt cleared human reaſon from the miſts of errors, ſays, in his excellent Treatiſe on Toleration,

"Again that church can have no right to be tolerated by the magiſtrate, which is conſtituted upon ſuch a bottom, that thoſe who enter it do thereby, *ipso facto*, deliver themſelves up to the protection and ſervice of another prince; for by this means the magiſtrate would give way to the ſettling of a foreign juriſdiction in his own country, and ſuffer his own people to be liſted, as it were, for ſoldiers againſt his own government."

The reader will be enabled to form a competent opinion of Mr. Plowden's religious and political principles, from theſe curſory remarks on his works.

I ſhall conclude, then, by informing him, that his poſtliminious preface was written to defend his voluminous review from the excellent Strictures made on it; and as he has had the audacity to treat with indecent ſcurrility ſome diſtinguiſhed members of both Houſes of Parliament, I hope the reader will approve of the caſtigation which I have given him, and which he ſo well deſerves.

(To be concluded in our next.)

Godwin's Life and Age of Chaucer.

(Concluded from p. 167.)

CHAUCER, while in exile, was involved in pecuniary embarraſſments, and our author feelingly laments his diſtreſs. The perſons to whom he truſted the management of his affairs proved treacherous; detained his income, and even let his apartments, without accounting for the rent. His reſources failed, and his friends not only deſerted, but robbed him. With regard to money matters, indeed, he ſeems never to have been remarkable for prudence; and he probably, therefore,

* For this reaſon the Proteſtant ſtates ſhould be on their guard, as popery is advancing with rapid and alarming ſtrides, both in England and Ireland,

derived

derived no aſſiſtance from former ſavings. In 1386 he ventured to return, hoping, we may ſuppoſe, that he ſhould be ſuffered to remain unmoleſted and obſcure, in the boſom of his country. In this, however, he was diſappointed. He was, for whatever reaſon, arreſted by an order from the court, and committed priſoner, moſt probably to the Tower.

It was againſt the adminiſtration of the King that Chaucer had ſtruggled; and it was by them that he was committed to priſon. But in October of this year Thomas of Woodſtock ſucceeded in ſubverting the royal authority; and in December following, Chaucer was deprived of his offices of comptroller of the cuſtoms, and of the ſmall cuſtoms in the port of London. The King's miniſters had treated him with tenderneſs and lenity. "It was reſerved," ſays our author, "for Thomas of Woodſtock, the patron of Gower, and [dele *and*] who had ſo lately ſhewn himſelf the vehement and intemperate partiſan of John of Gaunt, but in whom ambition finally ſwallowed up every other ſentiment, while he continued Chaucer's confinement in the Tower, to deprive him of his principal means of competence and ſubſiſtence." (P. 469.) There is here ſome incomprehenſible myſtery, which we wiſh to ſee explained. How is it reconcileable with Woodſtock's zeal for his brother's cauſe that he ſhould thus unmercifully perſecute, to ruin, the man who was his brother's firmeſt adherent and friend?

The treaſon, inſolence, and cruelty of Woodſtock were carried to the moſt incredible exceſs, by the inſtrumentality of that profligate aſſembly which obtained the name of the "Wonder-working Parliament." Chaucer's ſituation was now ſufficiently forlorn; it was doubtful whether he had moſt to fear from the continuance of the uſurpation, or from the reſtoration of the royal authority. In this ſeaſon of adverſity it is pleaſing to find him deriving employment and conſolation from the reſources of his own mind. Chaucer, in his youth, had tranſlated Boethius; and, as Boethius, in priſon, had written the "Conſolation of Philoſophy," ſo Chaucer, in a ſimilar condition, wrote, but in a ſtyle much more myſtical and obſcure, the "Teſtament of Love."

In this production, which Mr. G. appreciates with his uſual accuracy and correctneſs of taſte, Chaucer complains too much; and, of courſe, weakens the commiſeration of his readers. One paſſage, which Mr. G. has quoted, (p. 483.) contains a very curious diſplay of Chaucer's high eſtimation of his own merits as a poet. But the time of his deliverance was now approaching. On the 3d of May, 1389, Richard defeated the faction of Woodſtock; and, on the 12th of July following, Chaucer was appointed to the honourable and lucrative office of clerk of the works. It would ſeem, however, that he did not obtain his enlargement unconditionally, and that the terms of it were an ample confeſſion of his former tranſgreſſions, in the conteſt with the city, and an information againſt his aſſociates. For our knowledge of this incident in the poet's life we are indebted to the

poet

poet himself alone. He has mentioned it, in his "Teſtament of Love;" but has neither named the perſons whom he impeached, nor his motives for impeaching them. He ſeems to refer to perſons of higher rank than the magiſtrates of London: for "of the confederacies," he ſays, "marked by my ſoverains, I *nas* [ne was, was not] but a ſervaunt." Who theſe *ſoverains* were is not known; Mr. G. thinks that Chaucer could not mean Woodſtock and the other uſurpers, becauſe the King behaved to them on this occaſion with the greateſt clemency. Leaſt of all could he mean, in our author's opinion, John of Gaunt, becauſe Richard conſidered him ever after as loyal, and reſorted to him, in all trying circumſtances, as his firmeſt friend. Of the reaſons here aſſigned by our author, particularly of that which relates to Woodſtock and his faction, our readers cannot fail to perceive the weakneſs. If the King was naturally merciful, as we are convinced was the caſe, he would not incline to puniſh thoſe traitors to the extent of their crimes. But, ſuppoſing that he had ſo inclined, we can eaſily conceive him to have been reſtrained by prudence or by fear. With regard to Gaunt, although Mr. G. labours hard to make him a character nearly perfect, he had undoubtedly ſplendid faults as well as virtues. We do not, indeed, believe that he was diſloyal; but his darling idol was *popularity:* and the practice of every factious demagogue ſhews that nothing is conſidered ſo ſure a means of propitiating this idol, as to clamour and buſtle for the privileges of the people in oppoſition to the crown. The conduct of Chaucer, on this occaſion, is regarded by our author as the moſt diſhonourable action of his life. But this is an inference totally unwarranted. It might be either diſhonourable or laudable in a high degree; but before we can determine which epithet it deſerves, a more intimate acquaintance with the circumſtances of it is requiſite than we are ever likely to attain.

In 1386, John of Gaunt, with an army of 20,000 men, ſailed on an expedition into Spain, from which he returned in 1389. Though, by this attempt, he failed to acquire poſſeſſion of Caſtille, he enriched himſelf, and ſucceeded in entailing, by the marriage of his daughters, the crowns of both Caſtille and Portugal on the heads of his deſcendants. On his return he was created Duke of Aquitaine, without the rights of feudal ſovereignty, as it had been held by his brother, the Black Prince. And here our author examines an abſurd ſtory of his having, in full parliament, demanded that his ſon, Henry of Bolingbroke, ſhould be publicly acknowleged preſumptive heir to the crown. The ſtory bears forgery on the very face of it. The true heir, in failure of royal iſſue, was Roger Mortimer, Earl of March, eldeſt ſon of Philippa, only daughter of Lionel, Duke of Clarence, and he had accordingly been recognized as ſuch. But this fable was afterwards induſtriouſly propagated by the crafty cold-hearted Henry IV. as a kind of ſupport to his villainous uſurpation.

In 1391, Chaucer loſt an income equivalent to 657l. in modern money, being the amount of his ſalary as clerk of the works. Whether

ther he reſigned, or was ſuperſeded, does not appear. There is a tradition which repreſents him as paſſing ſome of his laſt years at Woodſtock, where he planned and executed his greateſt work, the Canterbury Tales.

Our author here again reſumes the breach which took place between Chaucer and Gower. The cauſe of it, he ſays, it is difficult to diſcover. Gower viſited Chaucer in priſon; and Mr. G. conjectures that the original ground of the miſunderſtanding might be a ſuſpicion entertained by Chaucer of his friend's not having been ſufficiently zealous in ſoliciting, from Thomas of Woodſtock, his releaſe. The ſentiment of averſion produced by this ſuſpicion, our author alſo conjectures, may have been increaſed by the publication of Gower's "De Confeſſione Amantis." At any other time Chaucer, he thinks, would have looked on this capital publication with pleaſure. "But poiſoned, as his feelings were towards Gower, he viewed it as a new act of animoſity. Gower, who had hitherto written only in Latin and French, appeared, in his eyes, not contented with treacherouſly betraying the man that loved him, as now taking up the pen in Engliſh, with the baſe purpoſe of annihilating his literary fame. It ſeems therefore to have been reſentment and indignation that firſt inſpired Chaucer, at an advanced age, with the admirable project of his Canterbury Tales." (P. 509.) All this, however, is *mere conjecture*, without ſo much as even the appearance of proof. The real cauſe of the final breach between Chaucer and Gower, we are perſuaded, was that which we before aſſigned, the abhorrence excited in the mind of the former by the ſubſequent diſloyalty and meanneſs of the latter. In 1394, Chaucer obtained a penſion of 20l. in modern money, 360l. for the remainder of his life.

In the beginning of 1396, John of Gaunt, having been, by the death of his Spaniſh conſort, a widower, for nearly eighteen months, publicly married Catharine, Lady Swinford, the ſiſter of Chaucer's wife. She had lived with him in a ſtate of criminal intimacy for twenty years, and had borne him three ſons, who were afterwards known as Earl of Somerſet, Cardinal Beaufort, and Duke of Exeter, and who, in 1397, were, by act of Parliament, legitimated by name. Our author ſuppoſes this marriage connected with the poet's reſidence at Donnington Caſtle, in the county of Berks. That he did reſide there ſeems ſufficiently certain; but we cannot believe him to have been opulent enough to purchaſe an eſtate. Mr. Godwin, therefore, thinks that he owed it to the munificence of John of Gaunt, who, having married a woman inferior to himſelf, reſolved to ennoble, according to the ideas of the feudal times, the huſband of her ſiſter. In 1398 we find Chaucer obtaining a patent of protection, the ſpecification of which is not known; and likewiſe the grant of a tun of wine yearly, which is ſcarcely more than half as much as was granted him in 1374.

In his fifty-third chapter Mr. Godwin treats of the king's ſecond marriage with Iſabella of France; of the ſecond conſpiracy, and of the death,

death, or as our author chuſes to call it, the aſſaſſination of Woodſtock; of the quarrel between Bolingbroke and Mowbray, Duke of Norfolk, on which there reſts an impenetrable myſtery, as well as on the conduct of the king in that cauſe; of the death and character of John of Gaunt; of the depoſition of Richard II.; of Chaucer's behaviour on that event; a behaviour deſerving of every praiſe; of the favours conferred on him by the new ſovereign; and of his removal to London, where he died.

The Duke of Lancaſter died Feb. 3, 1399, in the 59th year of his age. Concerning the immediate cauſe of his death there remains on record a curious document, which has engaged a conſiderable portion of attention. It is contained in a manuſcript work of a Dr. Thomas Gaſcoigne, intitled, "Dictionarium Theologicum," which is preſerved in Lincoln College, in Oxford. Dr. Gaſcoigne was a diſtinguiſhed member of the Univerſity, having twice diſcharged the office of Chancellor, and died in 1457. We ſhall give his ſtory in his own words.

"Novi ego, magiſter Thomas Gaſcoigne, licet indignus, Sacræ Theologiæ Doctor, qui hæc ſcripſi et collegi, diverſos viros, qui mortui fuerunt ex putrefactione membrorum ſuorum genitalium et corporis ſui; quæ corruptio et putrefactio, ut ipſi dixerunt, cauſata fuit per exercitium copulæ carnalis cum mulieribus. Magnus enim Dux in Angliâ, ſcilicet J. de Gaunt, mortuus eſt ex tali putrefactione membrorum genitalium et corporis ſui, cauſata per frequentationem mulierum. Magnus enim fornicator fuit, ut in toto regno Angliæ divulgabatur: et ante mortem ſuam, jacens ſic infirmus in lecto, eandem putrefactionem regi Angliæ, Ricardo Secundo, oſtendit, cum idem rex eundem Ducem in ſuâ infirmitate viſitavit; et dixit mihi qui iſta novit, unus fidelis Sacræ Theologiæ Baccalaureus,"

Of the charge here exhibited againſt his favourite character our author has attempted a refutation, which, we are ſorry to ſay, is little creditable to his candour, to his information, or to his ſagacity. It diſcovers, indeed, a degree of prejudice, and even of ignorance, which we were not, by any means, prepared to expect. The ſtory he attributes to "the ſpleen of the church." The Duke of Lancaſter was a favourer of Wickliffe, and conſequently a heretic. And "it is well known," ſays our author, "that the circumſtances attending the laſt moments of heretics and infidels have ever formed a favourite topic to their more fortunate and immaculate oppoſers." In confirmation of this fact he alleges the aſſertion of Walſingham, that Wickliffe died by the judgment of God; and on ſuch aſſertions he gives us the comment of honeſt Anthony Wood, who was certainly, as he obſerves, no friend to innovation, and whoſe words we deem it neceſſary to quote.

"The ſame perſons further affirm John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaſter, becauſe he was a patron of Wickliffe, *pudendis ſuis miſerum in modum ulceribus exeſis occubuiſſe*, and add that, being devoted to lewd women, he contracted a venereal contagion. Whether theſe things are true or feigned, for the gratification of hatred, I ſhall not diſpute. Certainly moſt authors aſſert that this diſeaſe was firſt known in the world long after this period; and it

was

was held, even in the reign of Hen. VIII. so infectious, as for it to have made one of the articles of treasonable accusation against Cardinal Wolsey, that he approached the royal person at a time when he knew himself to be afflicted with this disorder."

In order to discredit Gascoigne's testimony, our author states a fact which, whether true or false, is nothing to the purpose. In 1406, a testimonial was issued, in favour of Wickliffe, in the name of the University, and to this testimonial the common seal of the University was affixed. But Gascoigne affirms that the seal was clandestinely obtained, for the purpose, by a heretic of the name of Peter Payne. Our ingenious author, taking it for granted that this affirmation is false, concludes that Gascoigne is unworthy of belief, and even says that his tale about John of Gaunt has "certainly every inherent token of a premeditated calumny. His 'honest Bachelor of Divinity' is introduced in a manner in which no witness was ever brought to *an honest tale.*" [Extraordinary phraseology surely.] Mr. Godwin then urges the improbability that John of Gaunt was a common fornicator. "He was indeed," says our author, "in the theological sense, a fornicator; for he was for twenty years in familiar connection with Catharine Swinford without being her husband." By this it would appear that our able biographer has *yet* to learn the difference between *fornication* and *adultery*. He insists, however, that Gaunt's attachment to that lady is a presumption that he was not such a general libertine as Gascoigne would make him.

This story, which Mr. Godwin expressly calls "malicious," has "lately been revived," he says, "by the *sinister and ill-omened* industry of certain naturalists and antiquarians." Why the industry of these naturalists and antiquarians is thus described, we cannot conceive, unless Mr. Godwin would have every document destroyed, or, at least kept out of sight, which, in any degree, reflects on the character of John of Gaunt. But this would be such a dishonest wish as we cannot suppose our author capable of forming, much less of avowing. Of *malice*, however, in the relator, Gascoigne, we can see no traces. There is no appearance of his considering the disease of Gaunt as a judgment from God, or as inflicted on account of his patronizing Wickliffe. The case is very unaffectedly described as a simple fact; and Gascoigne accounts for it, not by a miraculous, but by a natural cause. It is not even represented as extraordinary; for it is given only as an instance of what had *frequently* happened, and the frequency of it is expressly attested on the authority of Gascoigne's personal knowledge. "*Novi* ego *diversos viros*, &c." and all the difference between these persons and John of Gaunt consists in this, that the case of the former is recorded from Gascoigne's *own* knowledge, while that of the latter depends on information communicated by another. Supposing the information to have been really given, which Mr. Godwin will not surely say is an impossible or absurd supposition, we wish to know how he would have had the "honest bachelor of divinity" introduced, and what proofs of fraud he discovers on the face of his testimony?

teſtimony? Our author ſays, indeed, that if the circumſtances [which] he (the bachelor) relates had made a ſubject of converſation between Richard II. and his dying uncle, this Chancellor of the Univerſity might have found witneſſes of a very different faſhion to atteſt his narrative. This is ſurely moſt extraordinary: where was he to find them? Does Mr. G. imagine that the utmoſt care would be taken to atteſt and render public, the diſgrace of the firſt prince of the blood? that a particular account of it, drawn up by a notary, and ſigned by witneſſes, would be lodged among the records of the empire? The ſymptoms of the caſe might, indeed, be whiſpered in converſation, and become generally known; but no other information with regard to it was to be expected.

And as in the teſtimony of Dr. Gaſcoigne there is nothing which has the appearance of fraud or of malice againſt Gaunt, ſo in the caſe itſelf there is nothing which carries an air of improbability. Our author, indeed, as well as Anthony Wood, ſeems to think that the diſtemper of J. of G. muſt neceſſarily have been what is now denominated the venereal diſeaſe. "The ſtory," he ſays, "has been ingeniouſly employed to vindicate the diſcoverers of America from the charge of introducing into Europe the moſt venomous of diſeaſes." The fact is as Mr. Godwin has ſtated it; for, though the greater number of phyſicians, we believe, as well as of hiſtorians and antiquarians, are agreed that this diſeaſe was imported from America, yet Dr. Sanchez and others have contended, with much learning and ability, that it was known in Europe long before. The firſt voyage of Columbus, when he diſcovered Cuba and St. Domingo, was in 1492, ninety-three years after the death of Gaunt, and thirty-five after that of Gaſcoigne. If, therefore, the ſymptoms deſcribed by Gaſcoigne be certainly thoſe of the venereal diſeaſe, it moſt unqueſtionably, unleſs the document be a forgery altogether, was known in his time; for he could not, without the ſpirit of prophecy, have, in order to calumniate the memory of Gaunt, invented the accurate deſcription of a diſeaſe which did not make its appearance till near 40 years after his death. But our author ſeems not to have known that even thoſe phyſicians who maintain, that the ſyphilitic virus firſt came from America, admit, and indeed contend, that, long before, a diſeaſe was known which, in all its chief ſymptoms, exactly reſembled the venereal, from which it differed only in not being derived from a ſpecific contagion. This diſeaſe, which our old authors often expreſs by the appellation of "THE BRENNING," that is, *the burning*, was contracted *ex humoribus acribus et putridis, in vagina muliebri collectis*; and, although it was not communicated, like the venereal, *per copulam carnalem*, from him who had contracted it, yet it frequently terminated fatally in the patients, "*qui mortui fuerunt*," to uſe Gaſcoigne's words, "*ex putrefactione membrorum ſuorum genitalium et corporis ſui.* Of this diſtemper, its cauſe, ſymptoms, and virulence, our readers may find an account in the firſt volume of Freind's

Freind's Hiſtory of Phyſic, where the caſe of John of Gaunt is particularly mentioned, and his death aſcribed to it.

Our author, however, is greatly offended that ſo immaculate a character as John of Gaunt ſhould be thought to have died from ſo diſgraceful a cauſe; but his zeal ſeems here to have blinded his judgment. It was hardly, we really think, worth our author's while to attempt the vindication, from a charge of fornication, of the man who, by our author's own acknowledgment, lived ſo many years in a ſtate of adultery. Nor can Mr. Godwin be ignorant that the length of Gaunt's attachment to Catherine Swinford affords no preſumption againſt the truth of the charge. Gaunt, it is evident, though a brave, magnificent, and high minded prince, was far from being a ſaint. On the contrary, his life ſeems to have been as free as his principles were latitudinarian; and, conſequently, he was as likely to have owed his death to the cauſe aſſigned by Dr. Gaſcoigne as any man of his times. We cannot quit this ſubject without remarking the ſtrange and very cenſurable partiality of our ingenious author. The character and conduct of Richard II. have come down to us loaded with infamy and vice by the mercenary hiſtorians of the Houſe of Lancaſter. Yet in the repreſentations of theſe venal hiſtorians, who had every motive to diſguiſe, and even to falſify the truth, Mr. Godwin acquieſces without ſeeming to entertain a ſingle doubt. But when Dr. Gaſcoigne, in a document which diſcovers not one ſign of bad faith or of malicious intentions, reflects on the character of John of Gaunt, our author's reſentment is rouſed to ſuch a pitch, that he has equally loſt ſight of the laws of evidence and of the duties of an impartial writer.

Chaucer died in London, October 25, 1400, and was buried, as already obſerved, in Weſtminſter Abbey, which was ſurely honoured by receiving his remains. "It is likely," ſays our author, "that Thomas Chaucer ſtood by, and ſaw the remains of his father quietly depoſited in the grave. It is likely that his funeral was attended by his nephew, Beaufort, biſhop of Lincoln, and the brother of the biſhop, the Lord Great Chamberlain of England." (P. 559.) This is all, unqueſtionably, likely enough; but was it neceſſary that Mr. Godwin ſhould ſuggeſt it? What follows, however, is ſtill more extraordinary. "If theſe circumſtances," he ſays, "add nothing to the genuine honours of Chaucer, and if we confeſs the name of the poet to be greater than all the denominations which monarchs can beſtow, yet the moſt faſtidious philoſopher may be gratified to ſee things as they actually were, and to be an attendant in imagination upon the herſe of Chaucer." Not to mention the trivial nature of theſe reflections, which our ingenious biographer appears to conſider as profound: do we ſee things, it may be aſked, *as they actually were* by becoming *attendants in imagination?*

The LVth, or concluding, chapter of Mr. Godwin's book is wholly employed on Chaucer's character, which is drawn at full length,

length, with the lineaments very distinctly marked, but, for the most part, we think, in a very bad taste. A great number of successive paragraphs begin with the words "Chaucer was." For example: "Chaucer was a courtier—Chaucer was an ambassador—Chaucer was a minister—Chaucer was a patriot, &c." As this can hardly be supposed to have happened without a studied design, it suggests the idea of affectation and pedantry. But what, in this chapter, chiefly disgusts us, is the air of importance which Mr. Godwin puts on in presenting us with trivial and puerile reflections, as if they were of the most interesting nature. Concerning the poet's removing to Donnington, our author thus writes: "John of Gaunt at this time married Chaucer's kinswoman, and he told the poet" [*who told our author so?*] "that now, being nearly allied to royalty, he must change the style in which he had hitherto lived. Chaucer consented. An ancient castle opened its ample gates, and spread out its spacious apartments, to receive him as its inhabitant. Chaucer brought hither the same gay and well-tempered mind which had accompanied him through life: he sat under his own oaks, and in a truly social spirit named them after his benefactors and patrons." (P. 565.) This is bad enough; but what we are going to subjoin is much worse. Mr. Godwin is speaking of Chaucer's testimony in a cause of arms between Grosvenor and Scrope. "He describes himself as walking in Friday-street, in the city of London, and observing there the arms which he had always seen borne by the family of Scrope, hung out as a sign. This inconsiderable circumstance immediately excites an interest in the patriarch of the English language and of English poetry. The Scropes were his friends. He accosts a stranger whom he perceives accidentally standing by, and asks, what inn is that, which I observe has hung out the arms of Scrope for its sign!—Nay, replied the other, it is no inn, nor are those the arms of Scrope; they are the shield of a Cheshire family of the name of Grosvenor." So much for the fact: now for the reflection. "In Chaucer, *the thus addressing himself* to a person unknown, is no evidence of a vulgar, indelicate, and undiscriminating mind. It shews that he was a character, not fastidious enough to refuse to interest itself in trifles, and frank, and even affable, in his intercourse with mankind." (P. 569.) This is, surely, a burlesque on profound observation. Yet our author's summary appreciation of Chaucer's merit as a poet is written with just discrimination, and much accurate remark. We shall copy the last paragraph of the book.

"His best works, his Canterbury Tales in particular, have an absolute merit which stands in need of no extrinsic accident to shew it to advantage, and no apology to atone for its concomitant defects. They class with whatever is best in the poetry of any country or any age. Yet when we further recollect, that they were written in a remote and semi-barbarous age, that Chaucer had, to a certain degree, to create a language, or to restore to credit a language which had been sunk into vulgarity and contempt, by being considered as *a* [the] language of slaves, that history existed only in unconnected fragments, and that his writings, stupendous

as we find them, are aſſociated, as to the period of their production, with the firſt half-aſſured liſpings of civilization and the muſe, the aſtoniſhment and awe with which we regard the great father of Engliſh poetry muſt be exceedingly increaſed, and the lover of human nature, and of intellectual power, will deem no time miſpent that adds to his familiar acquaintance with the hiſtory of ſuch a man, or with writings ſo produced."

Of the ſtyle of Mr. G.'s work we have ſpoken in terms of general commendation. In many inſtances it is ſtriking beautiful, yet we ſhould not diſcharge our duty to the public, if we did not obſerve that it is marked by ſtriking peculiarities and ſome groſs deformities. We have firſt to remark the author's almoſt conſtant ſuppreſſion of the relative pronoun, whenever it is governed by the following verb: Thus, "The firſt romances *we poſſeſs*," for *which we poſſeſs*; "ſhe was the deity *he adored*," for *whom he adored*. This elliptical conſtruction has long, we are aware, been adopted in poetry, where many liberties are reaſonably allowed on account of the difficulties to which the poet is expoſed. We are ſorry, however, to ſee it prevailing ſo frequently in proſe, eſpecially in grave and dignified compoſition. Many, indeed, of our beſt writers employ it; but we cannot help conſidering it as a manifeſt defect. The uſe of it we have ſometimes heard defended, and that, too, even by men of undiſputed taſte, who alleged that, in many caſes, it contributes highly to euphony and rhythm; but we hardly ever obſerved an inſtance where we could certainly pronounce that it had this effect. Mr. G. ſeems to have ſome particular reaſon for his uniform uſe of it; for ſo prominent a character is it of his ſtyle, that we have noticed hardly fewer than 300 places in which it occurs. It ſometimes appears with a moſt awkward grace, as in the following ſentence: "All thoſe things became gratifying to his heart, on account of *the paſſion they ſpoke*, and *the object to which they were paid*." (II. 287.) Why ſhould the relative be admitted in one of theſe clauſes, and excluded from the other, when the form of both is the ſame? We may give another example, at leaſt equally unaccountable. "A variety of circumſtances now favoured the career of Wicliffe; the ſchiſm of the church; *the countenance he had received from the great*; and the open *favour which his doctrines obtained* from the multitude." (II. 376.) If Mr. G. can point out any ſolid ground for the difference of ſyntax in the two laſt clauſes of the ſentence juſt quoted, we ſhall be glad to be informed of it.

Another fault of much the ſame kind, very common with our author, is the omiſſion of what is called the conjunction *that* in ſuch ſentences as this: "Every thing partakes of the author, as if he thought [*that*] he ſhould be everlaſtingly diſgraced by becoming natural, inartificial, and alive." (I. 318.) Than a ſentence in which both omiſſions, that of the relative, and that of the conjunction, are conjoined, it is impoſſible to conceive any thing more maimed and hobbling. "Such is the idea of the ſtate of poetry and refinement [*which*] it is proper [*that*] we ſhould bring with us, when we proceed to the examination of Chaucer's earlieſt conſiderable production, the Court of Love." (I. 231.)

Mr.

Mr. G. very frequently misplaces the adverb *only*; an arrangement by which he often conveys a meaning entirely different from what he intends. Thus, "The Saracens," says Mr. G. "were *only* checked in their career by the military prowess of Charles Martel in 732." (II. 47.) These words, in their natural construction, signify that the Saracens received *nothing more than a check*, which check was given them by Charles Martel in 732. But the author's meaning is, that they received *no check until they received it* from that warrior. In the same page is another sentence of which the construction is particularly faulty, owing to the same cause. "The court of the Black Prince—was *not only* the resort of noblemen and warriors, but also of crowned heads." Here the words *not only* ought evidently to have followed *resort*, instead of going before it. By the improper collocation of this adverb, the following account of the romantic or burlesque style is made to express a falshood. "In it," says our author, "the artificial and preconcerted is *only shewn*, and those fainter and evanescent touches, by which every man betrays the kind to which he belongs, are lost." (II. 579.) Here the adverb ought either to have stood the first word in the sentence, or to have been placed between *preconcerted* and *is*. Very many such faulty expressions might be given; and Mr. G. is the less excusable, because, in other instances, he has taken care to employ this adverb with the utmost propriety. "The Albigenses maintained that Jesus Christ—*only seemed* to have expired on the cross;" (II. 212.) where the position of the adverb is right, because the opposition is between *seeming to expire* and *really expiring*. In this respect, too, the following sentence is entitled to praise, although in another the construction is clumsy: "Nor was the King of Castille only prevented from *assisting, or understanding the condition of, his family* and country; he was exposed to the most painful anxiety as to his own situation and the clearness of his fame." (II. 232.) The words here opposed are *prevented* and *exposed*; and this opposition is precisely pointed out by the place of the adverb; but the words in italics are tacked together in a way which discovers either want of skill, or inattention to neatness.

Another great impropriety in Mr. G.'s style consists in his manner of construing the present participles of verbs. He uses them as participles at the very same moment in which he converts them into verbal nouns. "The Earl of Richmond had an inclination to *the writing English verses.*" (I. 432.) "*The killing a deer*—was punished, &c.; when the *killing a man* could be atoned for, &c." (I. 112, 113.) This mode of writing is both slovenly and inaccurate. Whenever the article is prefixed the word is a noun, and must be construed as such. Mr. G. therefore, ought to have said "*the writing of English verses*," as well as "*the killing of a deer*" and "*the killing of a man.*" We thought that this preposterous construction of the participle, which involves, in truth, a glaring inconsistency, had been wholly abandoned; and Mr. G. in one place, which we have remarked, is right. He talks of the influence of the mendicant friars "in regard

to the maſs of young perſons, to *the inveigling of whom* their arts were directed." (I. 195.)

Our author has likewiſe adopted a practice which cannot be reprobated with too much ſeverity; the practice of debaſing a pure Engliſh ſtyle by the pedantry of introducing, every now and then, ſome word from the French. Of theſe words we have *ennui*, *eclat*, *naiveté*, *amours*, *coup-de-main*, *beaux eſprits*, and *traits* of diſpoſition. By turning to pages 347, 348. of our XIth Volume, our readers will find that we have formerly declared our decided diſapprobation of ſuch motley compoſition; of ſuch a

——"party-colour'd dreſs
Of patch'd and piebald languages."

If a man, who writes in his native tongue, is perpetually recurring to foreign languages, the concluſion will be that he is not maſter of his own; and for an Engliſhman eſpecially, whoſe copious ſpeech is, by candid foreigners themſelves, (as, in the place referred to, we have ſhewn is the caſe,) allowed to be the firſt language in modern Europe, to forget this acknowledged ſuperiority, and to feed the vanity of our aſſuming neighbours, by making downright gibberiſh of his own ſtyle, is ſurely diſgraceful. Beſides, it will not be alleged, that the idea annexed to any of the French words employed by our author is incapable of being expreſſed in Engliſh; ſo that their introduction is wholly unneceſſary. We are well aware, indeed, that ſome ideas are expreſſed with more neatneſs and preciſion in one language than in another; but it is clearly the duty of every writer to conform to the genius of the language in which he writes, and to ſearch its ſtores for appropriate idioms and phraſes, inſtead of indulging his own lazineſs or eaſe by borrowing elſewhere.

Mr. G. however, uſes many words, which though they are not French, have no title to be conſidered as Engliſh; and which, with a liberty diſproportioned, we ſuſpect, to his rank in the republic of letters, he has taken upon himſelf to employ without ſufficient authority. Such are *intellectualized*, *ſuperſubtle*, *praxiſes*, a moſt vile ſounding word, *narrate*, which is Scotch, *humanneſs*, *aſpirant*, *technicalities*, *uncontrol*, *outfit*, *denaturalized*, &c. Of *picturesque* we ſhall not complain, becauſe what could our modern touriſts do without it? Yet it very evidently is not fully naturalized; and beſides, it is made to ſignify any thing or nothing. Several of Mr. Godwin's words are either obſolete or improper for proſe; as *perdurable*, *to tender*, for *to treat tenderly*, *imbecile*, *awe-inſpiring*, *inſtinct*, uſed as an adjective, &c. In many caſes where his words are good, his application or conſtruction of them is not conformable to the genius of the language. Thus we have "inſpiring *in* their own breaſts ſentiments;" "aſſociated to his children;" "feelings *were* originated;" "*compulſory* alliance," for *forced* alliance; "*to revolt*" uſed tranſitively, in the ſenſe of *to alienate*; "occaſion *to*" for occaſion *of*; "caſt *in* the ſcene of theſe commotions;" "privy *of* this," which is ſo bad, that we are inclined

inclined to believe it an error of the preſs. To theſe may be added, "knight-errants," which, certainly, ſhould be *knights-errant*, as our author has elſewhere *poets-laureat*; "his effigies *were* placed;" "had *trod*," for *had trodden*; and "to *diſcharge* concerns," for to *tranſact them*. At p. 321. Vol. I. *deriſion* is improperly called *an epithet*.

Our author's ſentences are ſometimes embarraſſed, and very careleſsly conſtructed. At Pp. 114, 115, of Vol. I. a hawk is three times called *it*, and immediately after *him*. At p. 258. the author's phraſeology conveys the idea that Chaucer and Milton lived at the ſame period. The following ſentences are very ſlovenly, if not ungrammatical. "Lollius, *of whom* it ſeems abſurd to dispute the exiſtence, *or to confound him* as an author with the Florentine noveliſt, may, &c." I. 275. "When men *whoſe* hearts ſhould be pure, *and their office reſpected*, are thus treated with open contumely, it is impoſſible, &c. p. 367. In p. 416. Mr. Godwin writes thus: "Seven years was the regular period *in which for the candidate for knighthood to remain* in the rank of page, and ſeven years longer he was an eſquire." Can any thing be conceived more clumſy than the march of this ſentence? The following is ſuch an inſtance of careleſſneſs as we have ſeldom ſeen. "Charles V. ſaw that the inhabitants of Picardy and Aquitaine earneſtly deſired to return under the ſway of their native ſovereign, and he was convinced that nothing could tend more ſtrongly *to that purpoſe*, than his carefully providing for them time and opportunities *for that purpoſe*, and waſting the ſtrength of the adverſary in inactive campaigns." II. 76. Of ſuch careleſſneſs we ſhall give yet one inſtance more, which is ſtrikingly ungrammatical. It occurs Vol. II. p. 443. "Chaucer muſt have been unworthy [of] the name of a man, *if he had ſeen* the deſtruction of the liberties of his native place, combined with a black and infamous plot againſt the life of an innocent prince, perhaps the worthieſt and moſt valuable member of the commonwealth, *and not have exerted* every faculty [which] he poſſeſſed to defeat it." The end of this ſentence is curiouſly inconſiſtent with the beginning. *And not have exerted* ſhould evidently have been either *and not exerted*, or, more properly ſtill, *and had not exerted*.

Mr. Godwin is not always ſufficiently careful to employ the proper modes and tenſes of his verbs. "A candidate for knighthood *muſt be* groſsly recreant to the true ſpirit of his profeſſion, if he thought of the female ſex with any ſentiments of rude familiarity and diſreſpect." I. 410. For *muſt be* Mr. Godwin ſhould have written *muſt have been*. At p. 133. of Vol. II. our author, ſpeaking of the removal of Wykeham from the miniſtry, ſays, "It appears as if the meaſure *were* concerted between [amongſt] all the three parties." This is very bad; for the ſenſe moſt evidently requires *had been*. At p. 216. "He *bid* them inſpect, examine, and inquire:" where *bid* is uſed as the præterite tenſe. And at p. 372. we have the following paſſage, in which *were* is improperly uſed for *was*. "But if he," that is Gaunt, "*were* the individual in England to whom it belonged

to redreſs grievances, and check abuſes, we may eaſily believe that no perſons were quicker to diſcern this circumſtance than the confidential adviſers of the deluded Richard." The following is ſo glaring an offence againſt conſiſtency in the uſe of the tenſes, that we wonder how it eſcaped our ſagacious author's obſervation. "As ſoon as Chaucer *had reached* the caſtle, he *diſcovers* that it is conſtructed of one perfect beryl." II. 189

The inſtances in which Mr. Godwin is chargeable with affected phraſeology are almoſt innumerable. We ſhall point out a few of the moſt reprehenſible. The firſt ſentence of his book, we believe, is not Engliſh: "The queſtion *of when Chaucer was born and when he died* . . . . is involved in inconſiderable obſcurity." Our author, afterwards, at page 21. Vol. I. ſpeaks of the ſciences not having yet *denizened* themſelves at Oxford and Cambridge. At p. 302. he calls Chaucer, Mandeville, Wickliffe, and Gower, "The evangeliſts of our tongue," an expreſſion which has no appropriate beauty, and is, beſides, profane. At p. 437. he talks of "heroes who had won immortal *note*;" where *fame* or *honour* would be infinitely preferable. At Pp. 37, 38. Vol. II. we hear of "works ſtamped with the marks of energy and *individuality of thinking*;" the preciſe meaning of which expreſſion we ſhould be glad to know. At p. 54. "the younger knights," inſtead of having their ſpirits elevated, "felt their *circulation augmented*," at the ſight of the valley of Roncevalles. Wykeham, our author ſays, p. 129. "was ſober, ſagacious, and penetrating; with *no mercurialneſs of temper* calculated to involve him in diſgrace . . . . *Handſome he appears to have been, and tall:*" a moſt affected inverſion. At p. 360. Mr. Godwin ſpeaks of Richard II. as "being now a huſband, and *inſtalled in the faculties and immunities of a man.*" This is ſurely ſufficiently unnatural; yet it is nothing to what we meet with at page 400. where we have "an ancient baron *neighboured to a throne.*" At p. 463. we have the "*intellectual famine to a poor eſtate*;" at p. 465. "the Herculeſ' pillars of human genius;" and, laſtly, at p. 579. we are aſſured that "*the ſtarts, and ſallies*, &c. of Hotſpur *are the very man* that the poet deſired to preſent to us."

But beſide theſe ſhort and occaſional examples, in which our author's affectation is, for the moſt part, confined to inſulated phraſes, he is ſometimes ſeized with more laſting fits of it, which, to ſay the truth, are exceedingly offenſive. Of theſe we have already adverted to more than one, and ſhall here exhibit the evidence of another, which palpably diſcovers itſelf in a ſtudied diſplay of ſententious brevity, continued to a very conſiderable extent. Mr. Godwin, we doubt not, thought the paſſage very fine, but to us it ſeems written in the very worſt taſte. Chaucer, he ſays,

"Gave himſelf up to the impreſſions of nature, and to the ſenſations [which] he experienced. He ſtudied the writings of his contemporaries, and of certain of the ancients. He was learned, according to the learning of his day. He wrote, becauſe he felt himſelf impelled to write. He analyſed

analyſed the models which were before him. He ſought to pleaſe his friends and fellow-ſcholars in the two Univerſities. He aſpired to an extenſive and laſting reputation. He formed the gigantic and arduous plan of giving poetry to a language, which could as yet ſcarcely be ſaid to have any poetry to boaſt."

"Now he was placed in a different ſcene. Without bearing the title of the court-poet, he was the court-poet in reality. He had no competitor. His ſuperiority was univerſally acknowledged. He had been borne along on the tide of his acknowledged reputation to the eminence [which] he at preſent occupied. He had the character of his country to ſuſtain; and the literature of a nation reſted upon his ſhoulders." (Vol. I p. 436.)

We muſt now take leave of Mr. Godwin's work, which, with all its faults, is, in our opinion, a work of great merit. With regard to ſome of our ſtrictures upon it, we ſhall not be ſurprized though our author ſhould differ from us. Yet we have endeavoured to "ſpeak of it as it is," If we have "nothing extenuated," neither have we "ſet down aught in malice." If we have frequently found ourſelves obliged to condemn, our praiſe has been as liberally and cordially beſtowed, whenever we conceived that Mr. Godwin deſerved it. We have nothing more to add but that, excepting a very few typographical errors, the mechanical part of the work is executed with ſingular neatneſs; and that the author has ſhewn a very laudable attention to the convenience of his readers, by furniſhing them with what is of high importance, an exceedingly ample and accurate Index.

Letters on Sileſia; written during a Tour through that Country in the Years 1800, 1801. By his excellency John Quincy Adams, then Miniſter from the United States to the Court of Berlin; and ſince Member of the American Senate. 8vo. Pp. 387. 8s. Budd, London, 1804.

MR. ADAMS commenced his tour, July the 17th, 1800, and leaving Berlin, ſet out for Frankfort, on the Oder. Frankfort is an old town, containing about 12,000 inhabitants, of which one fourth are Jews. At Frankfort he remained ſeveral days, and had an opportunity of making remarks on the manners of the people. His obſervations are lively, but ſomewhat ſlight and deſultory; which laſt quality is, perhaps, not eaſily to be ſeparated from an account of a haſty tour. At Grunberg, the firſt town of Sileſia, on the ſide of Lower Saxony, he met with a Mr. Anders, a gentleman of ſome literary talents; and from him he heard an account of Garve, a German writer of conſiderable fame in his own country, who had died about two years before. The only ſpecimens of his ability that our touriſt mentions, are tranſlations into German of Cicero's Offices and Paley's Moral Philoſophy. Sileſia is fertile, nevertheleſs the peaſants are in a miſerable condition, and predial ſlavery ſubſiſts in great ſeve-

rity. The Catholics and Proteſtants reciprocally indulge all the hatred of ignorant and intolerant bigotry. The Sileſians appear to be a good deal addicted to ſuperſtition, and attribute great power and influence to an imaginary perſonage, whom they call Rubenzahl, a kind of a ſpirit who dwells in the mountains, and aſſumes as many ſhapes as Proteus. The hills of Sileſia are extremely beautiful and romantic; the mountains terrific and ſublime. From one of them originate two mighty rivers, which take a very different direction.

"It is (ſays our author) a remarkable circumſtance, that upon this mountain, and certainly within three or four Engliſh miles of each other, are the ſources of the Elbe and of the Oder, two of the largeſt rivers of Germany; one of which runs eaſterly, until it empties itſelf into the Baltic beyond Stettin, while the other takes its courſe weſtward, and rolls its waters into the North Sea at Cuxhaven. The ſources of both are numerous; for inſtead of eleven ſprings, which ſome of the German geographers would aſſign to the Elbe, there are probably here above fifty which pay their tribute to it, and the ſprings which finally ſend their ſtreams to the Oder on the Sileſian ſide, are equally numerous."

The Sileſian mountaineers our touriſt repreſents as in a moſt miſerable ſtate.

"Their houſes (he ſays) are ſituated at ſuch an elevation upon the mountains, that the ground will produce nothing but graſs, and they can raiſe nothing but cows, goats, and a few fowls. For ſix months in the year they are in a manner buried under the ſnow, and are cut off from all intercourſe with other human beings. Their log huts are of a ſingle ſtory, and a hay-loft; the floor below is divided into four apartments, one of which is a ſtable for their cattle, another their dairy, the third is the common dwelling place of all the family, and the fourth a very ſmall room for the reception of ſtrangers. The family room ſerves at once as kitchen, eating room, and bed room, and is heated with fires all the year round. There is a wide bench that goes all round the room on which they ſleep, for they have no beds."

The moſt lofty mountain is *Rieſen Koppe*, having a ſummit that is called the *Giant's Head*. Thence the proſpect is very grand and extenſive. In Sileſia, an attempt was made to produce beet ſugar; but it proved ineffectual. In ſome parts of Sileſia there are conſiderable manufactories of linen; and alſo a good deal of trade in that article. Mr. Adams was invited to a formal dinner of thirty faſhionable perſons. They ſat down ſoon after one, and roſe from table juſt before ſix.

"The whole of this time is employed in eating; for the ladies and gentlemen all roſe together, and there was very little wine drank. But as only one diſh is ſerved at a time, and in a dinner of three courſes, every diſh muſt be handed round to every gueſt; the intervals between the diſhes are of courſe very long; the uſual time of ſitting on ſuch occaſions we are told is about ſeven hours, but it was here abridged out of complaiſance to us. After dinner we walked in the garden, and coffee was ſerved in an arbour, where we ſat for ſome time and converſed. As evening came on,

the

the company sat down to cards, and played until eleven, when a cold collation was served in another room We were now permitted, as strangers, to return to our inn; but the rest of the company continued at their cards, and the collation until half past twelve. This is the usual course of a great dinner in Silesia."

To follow the tourist through the whole of his work, would occupy a greater portion of our journal than the comparative importance of these letters permits. Therefore without entering farther into its details, we shall content ourselves with observing, that the production before us exhibits no great powers, either in describing external nature, or in delineating manners. It is not, however, deficient in amusement, and will suit the taste of those who are fond of what is called light summer reading.

Buonaparté, and the French People under his Consulate. Translated from the German. 8vo. Pp. 380. 7s. Tipper and Richards, Leadenhall Street. 1804.

IN the "advertisement prefixed to this book, we are informed that it appeared in Germany a short time since; its sale was uncommonly rapid; but no sooner did it reach the First Consul, than he exerted his influence with the continental powers, and every where succeeded in obtaining its suppression."

While we deplore the degraded rule of those miserable powers who are subject to such influence, we cannot be surprised that the Corsican Usurper should be anxious to suppress a work, which, though it do not tell the *whole* truth, and though it gloss over many prominent circumstances with a false varnish, certainly exhibits a tolerably correct portrait of the reign and actions of the First Consul. If, indeed, the author had taken up his hero on his usurpation of the Consular Authority, we should have had little to object to his narrative; but having undertaken to trace him above, he ought to have related, with accuracy, such circumstances of his birth, education, and conduct, as he chose to notice; and by not doing so, he has subjected himself to serious censure. We learnt that he was the son of a lawyer of Ajaccio, in Corsica, "who possessed some land near that place;" and that he was patronized by General Marbœuf, Governor of the Island. But here the truth is concealed; for the author should have told us, that he was the offspring of an adulterous intercourse between M. de Marbœuf and the lawyer's wife. Again, we are informed, that he served at Toulon, as an officer of artillery, and was promoted to the rank of brigadier general after the reduction of the place; but not a word is said of his treachery and cruelty, as evinced in the cold-blooded massacre of fifteen hundred of the inhabitants, of both sexes, and of all ages; nor of the atrocious letter which he wrote on the occasion, and which we shall transcribe for the purpose of refreshing the author's memory: It was dated from Toulon, 29th Frimaire, year

year 2, anſwering to Dec. 24, 1793, of the Chriſtian Calendar, and was "addreſſed to the repreſentatives, Barras, Freron, and Robeſpierre.

"CITIZEN REPRESENTATIVES,

"Upon the field of glory, my feet inundated with the blood of traitors, I announce to you, with a heart beating with joy, that your orders are executed, and France revenged; neither ſex nor age has been ſpared; they who eſcaped, or who were only mutilated by the diſcharge of our republican cannon, were diſpatched by the ſwords of liberty, and the bayonets of equality, health and admiration.

BRUTUS BUONAPARTE,
CITIZEN SANS-CULOTTES."

Of his maſſacre of the Pariſians, in October 1795, nothing more is ſaid than that "he headed the troops as ſecond in command under Barras;" while the Pariſians are repreſented as a ſet of lawleſs inſurgents. His atrocious conduct to the Venetians is not only paſſed over without cenſure, but is indirectly juſtified, and the Venetians are accuſed of *treachery*!—His expedition to Egypt is gloſſed over in much the ſame way. We are informed that before he landed, he iſſued a proclamation, "recommending to his troops a reſpectful behaviour towards the Mahomedans, and the female ſex;" and are then told that "he laid Alexandria under contributions, and marched on to Cairo without delay." The maſſacre of the innocent and defenceleſs inhabitants is wholly ſuppreſſed. Again, "he proceeded to Syria, took Jaffa by ſtorm, beſieged the fortreſs of Saint-Jean D'Acre, defended by the Engliſh and Turks. After a bombardment of ſixty days, and repeated unſucceſsful aſſaults, he was compelled to retreat with his reduced army to Cairo." The murder of the 5000 Turks at Jaffa, and the poiſoning of his ſick on his retreat from Acre, were facts unworthy the notice of his biographer it ſeems, who inſinuates, however, that the Engliſh knew "of his deſign to quit Egypt, but ſuffered him to do ſo, fully perſuaded, that with the departure of the contriver of this expedition, the whole would inevitably fail." Thus while he ſuppreſſes known truths, he has recourſe to ſuppoſitious facts, which never entered the imagination of any man but himſelf. From theſe circumſtances, and from ſome remarks that are interſperſed through the work, we have been almoſt led to conclude, that the author is only diſpleaſed with Buonaparté for having overthrown the republic, and for having eſtabliſhed ſomething like a monarchy on its ruins. After his return from Egypt, and his ſubverſion of the directorial government, his biographer repreſents him as "the republican hero, who had even attempted to diſſeminate *knowledge and freedom* through the deſerts of Africa;" adding, "It was a happy moment: no hero, no legiſlator, in ancient or modern hiſtory, had ever been ſo ſucceſsful. All was prepared, the materials of a glorious conſtitution for mankind were at hand, ready at the diſpoſal of a truly great man, who, forgetful of his own intereſt, only ſtudied the good of mankind." What thoſe *materials* were, for the *univerſal* conſtitution, we

are

are left to conjecture; the author, however, admits that Buonaparté was *not* the great man who knew how to mould them into form, or to make a proper use or application of them; here, indeed, his remarks begin to assume the semblance and the tone of truth, sobriety, and justice; and notwithstanding the defects which we have noticed at the beginning of his work, and which are serious defects, as they tend to poison and corrupt the pure sources of historical knowledge, it certainly contains much useful information, and many sound and judicious reflections and observations upon the political measures, and internal economy, of the government of this Corsican upstart, during the existence of the Consulate. The following brief character of the constitution which Buonaparté *first* established for the preservation of *liberty* and *equality*, in his adopted country, is sufficiently just.

"A new constitution, as it was called, by which all public functions were to be subordinate to him, was introduced on the 15th of December; by it all authority was vested in the hands of one single man. And this same constitution was but a tool, which he might lay aside whenever he chose: a legislative body, without the power of imposing laws: a tribunate, with full powers to make complaints, which the governments had a right to disregard: a senate, incapable of enforcing its decrees. These were the bulwarks against the despotism of a man, in whose hands all executive power was lodged, who could propose laws, and even annihilate at once the constitution altogether."

That he possessed the power of annihilation his actions very soon demonstrated to the perfect conviction of the most incredulous. We pass over the superficial account of the battle of Marengo, the leading particulars of which are here greatly misrepresented, as far as Buonaparté was personally concerned, and proceed to the subsequent conduct of the Consul, on his return to Paris.

"The republican writers availed themselves of this opportunity to remind the Consul of his duties. Many of them spoke boldly, knowing how far the enthusiasm of gratitude can lead a noble heart, and fearing, lest he should give way to the lust of power, which too soon dazzles triumphant heroes, they particularly demanded the liberty of the press. They warned Bonaparte not to listen to those who should endeavour to inspire him with prejudices fatal to the friends of republicanism. Daunau, Jean de Brie, Constant, Riouste, Ginguenet, joined in these remonstrances. Bonaparte and his partisans used the means to stifle the public voice; they had already prohibited all patriotic newspapers: by their order many of the publishers and printers of them were sent to prison, after having seen their offices destroyed, and their printing machines taken away. A small number of the former political journals still existed, yet they were closely watched by the police. Some public papers, in the pay of government, set up against them. They recalled the old constitution, by which they understood nothing less than the introduction of all the terrors of former despotism, and of all former intolerance in matters of opinion. The priests and emigrants now returning in numbers, anxious to re-establish their wonted ascendancy and their prerogatives, joined these hirelings. They began with inveighing against Voltaire, Rousseau, Raynal, Montesquieu, Mably,

Mably, and other writers, who had dared to expoſe the follies and abuſes of former times. They ſtyled them indiſcriminately, atheiſts, blaſphemers, diſturbers of the public tranquility. The family of Bonaparte was highly pleaſed, to ſee theſe old experienced knights ſtand forward as champions in their cauſe, they gave them full ſcope, being ſure to come in for the harveſt before them.

Surrounded by a ſufficient number of new hirelings, Bonaparte felt himſelf confident that he was able to ſend them out of the way, or to annihilate them if they dared to be too loud and buſy. Many of the old nobility, that had remained in France, during the revolution, and had merited well of the country, were appointed to profitable places under the new adminiſtration. The latter took great care at the ſame time to occupy a number of the returned emigrants, by providing them with honourable employment in the provinces."

In this paſſage the author's real principles are pretty plainly manifeſted. He ſhews his partiality to the revolution itſelf; his attachment to the whole tribe of economiſts, and encyclopediſts, whoſe writings (we do not, of courſe, include the Preſident Monteſquieu in the number) had a direct tendency to produce it; and his notions of patriotiſm, in repreſenting thoſe who violated their moſt ſacred duties, and engaged in plans of rebellion and treaſon, as men who "had merited well of their country."

Of Buonaparté's firſt tyrannical attempt to remove all legal reſtraints which obſtructed the accompliſhment of his deſigns, by ſuſpending all the regular courts of juſtice, and by eſtabliſhing ſpecial tribunals in the departments, we have a very correct account.

"Theſe tribunals were to be compoſed of judges and military perſons; but the Firſt Conſul had the choice and appointment of them. They were to decide on all miſdemeanors and crimes (*crimes et délits*) for which any bodily chaſtiſement might be inflicted:—they were to try all perſons accuſed of theft, burglary, and violence, if committed with the aſſiſtance of one or more perſons:—they were to take cognizance of murder, coining, threats uttered againſt the purchaſers of national property, of exceſſes and aſſaults committed on them, and of incendiaries; and they were to proceed againſt all perſons accuſed of ſecretly engaging troops, or of bribing and endeavouring to corrupt the ſoldiers and conſcripts, or excite them to revolt: they were to inquire into all tumults, and to proceed againſt all perſons taken up in the act of rioting; laſtly, they were authoriſed to try all thoſe perſons who were already in priſon on ſuch charges. This new law, by which government was empowered to deprive the accuſed citizens of that protection which the glorious inſtitution of juries affords to the innocent—by which it was permitted to ſubject them to an abominable court, wholly dependent on the arbitrary will of government, yet fully authoriſed to take cognizance of almoſt every crime; met with ſome reſiſtance from the tribunate, whoſe duty it was to guard againſt all arbitrary proceedings, by which the ſafety of the people might be endangered. Thirteen orators ſpoke againſt it, forty-one oppoſed it by their vote, and it was carried only by a majority of eight.

A counſellor of ſtate, in the pay of government and its zealous defender, wrote a pamphlet againſt the oppoſing members of the tribunate, who had

had dared to check government in its deſpotic attempts: he inveighed againſt them, in the moſt outrageous and indecent manner—he expoſed them as known diſturbers of public peace and tranquility, and publiſhed their names; but thoſe very names bore witneſs againſt him."

Buonaparté was extremely enraged at this unexpected oppoſition to his ſupreme will, and had recourſe to an effectual means of preventing a repetition of it, by removing all ſuch members of the ſenatorial or legiſlative bodies, as preſumed to have a will of their own, diſſerent from his. He had firſt, however, recourſe to another meaſure, which placed his diſpoſition and his government in an equally favourable point of view.

"One violent meaſure, ſtriking the minds of all, and filling them with terror, by which the ſtate was about to be freed of ſeveral monſters, the notorious inſtruments of all the crimes perpetrated during the revolution, whoſe exiſtence was incompatible with the public peace and ſecurity of government, appeared at this time expedient to be adopted by Bonaparte.

"In ſpite of the oppoſition which his propoſal for a general deportation of all doubtful perſons in France, met with in the Senate, five and twenty votes being againſt the meaſure, it was decreed at once to deport one hundred and thirty French citizens who were thought dangerous. The conſervative Senate, where Sieyes very zealouſly ſtrove to promote this deſpotic reſolution, declared it by a ſpecial vote, to be a conſervative meaſure of the conſtitution, (une meſure conſervative de la conſtitution.)"

"A conſervative meaſure of the conſtitution," is a Galliciſm moſt offenſive to an Engliſh ear; it ſhould be a meaſure preſervative of the conſtitution; or rather, a meaſure neceſſary for the preſervation of the conſtitution. On the abominable tyranny of ſuch a meaſure, the object of which was to deprive a given number of individuals of the benefit of the law; to puniſh them, by an ex poſt facto decree, not only without conviction, but without trial, and even without a ſpecification of their crimes; it would be an inſult to BRITONS to expatiate. The bare mention of it is ſufficient to rouſe *their* indignation and to excite *their* horror.

The Abbé Geoffroy, editor of the *Journal des Debats*, is abuſed by the author for preſuming to cenſure Voltaire and Rouſſeau for their attempts to ſubvert religion, morality, and government. La Harpe, too, is equally abuſed for the moſt praiſe-worthy act of his whole life; that is, for retracting his revolutionary errors, and making all the amends in his power for his former efforts to inſtill revolutionary principles into the minds of his countrymen, by a publication (reviewed in one of our former Appendixes) which did him great honour.

"La Harpe, after having outlived himſelf too ſoon; after having been, in former times, and to the laſt year of the revolution, the moſt zealous defender, and moſt enthuſiaſtic eulogiſt of his teacher and friend, Voltaire, now joined the pious band of royal pious Roman Catholic dealers in damnation, and unmercifully condemned the old witty and arch ſinner to eternal flames. Though he moſt probably did not ſucceed in his charitable wiſhes,

wiſhes, he gained, however, ſome new readers of his *fallen mercury* at France, and made it ſell a little better."

We ſuſpect that this charge againſt La Harpe is very groſsly exaggerated, for we do not recollect to have ſeen in any of his writings, which we have read with conſiderable attention, any paſſage which would bear the author out in his aſſertion. But he is extremely offended with every man who has endeavoured to bring back the unhappy people of France to a ſenſe of religious duty.

"Beurrier, and ſome other of his caſt, preached and publiſhed ſermons, to the edification and converſion of all poor ſouls, infected by the doctrines of what was termed philoſophy, and the lives of the ſaints, abounding with popiſh and prieſtly exhortations; ſupplanted the well-written memoirs and biographies of ſtateſmen, heroes, and philoſophers, who had merited well of their country. One cannot help ſmiling, at the ſame time one truly pities theſe hypocritical fanatics, in obſerving what they pretend to call *philoſophers* and *philoſophy*.

They do not mean a Deſcartes, a Malebranche, a Bayle, and ſuch great men, when they declare war againſt their philoſophers; they mean, on the contrary, all thoſe eloquent and clever writers, who were men of letters and men of the world, who at the ſame time had courage enough to expoſe to the deceived multitude the folly and abſurdities of their leaders, and to caution them againſt deceitful glitterings and dark lanterns, by which they were dazz'ed: they mean all thoſe men who thought mankind capable of improvement, and deſerving a better fate, and who were in hopes to find out the right path that leads to ſacred truth; who wiſhed to raiſe the looks of mankind to heaven, and ſublime objects, inſtead of fettering them down to the earth, and yoking them like beaſts of burden. In ſhort, every man of good ſenſe, of real fellow-feeling and of humanity, who raiſed his voice againſt the crafty and political tyranny of prieſthood, was called by them a philoſopher; and they hoped to brand his name with infamy, by ſuch an appellation—poor miſerable beings!

Speaking of the means adopted for the pacification of La Vendée, the author truly obſerves, that the Vendeans "would not have been tranquilized ſo ſoon, if the emiſſaries of Bonaparte had not made them the ſame promiſes of a final reſtoration of their king, as they did about the re-eſtabliſhment of the Roman Catholic religion." He appears, however, to be diſſatisfied with an *eſtabliſhed* religion, and contends for the neceſſity of an equal toleration of all profeſſions of faith, which affords, at leaſt, a preſumptive proof that he is himſelf indifferent to all. He cautions the uſurper againſt the intrigues of the Catholic prieſts, who, he ſays, "tyrannize over the common people, and influence the minds of the purchaſers of national property;" he adds, that they have not yet been paid their penſions, "even for the firſt year," and that if they ſhould not be paid ſoon, they may be employed againſt himſelf. This certainly is the obſervation of a *friend*, and not of an *enemy*, to the Corſican. Of the means which Buonaparté adopted of annihilating the freedom of the preſs, we have the following account.

"The

"The orders ſent to all publiſhers of newſpapers, by which they were prohibited to notice any innovation and meaſure of ſafety, had given birth to a written bulletin, which was diſtributed at Paris, and frequently ſent abroad. The miniſter of police, Fouché, diſcovered at laſt the author to be one Fouilhaux; he had him taken up, and ſentenced him to deportation. The Conſul was much vexed at finding, after his return, that this very ſame bulletin was ſtill continued by the Courier de Londres, publiſhed in London. Offended in the higheſt degree at theſe public expoſures of his character, and fooliſhly imagining that he could ſtifle the public voice abroad, with the ſame facility as he had done in France, he ordered De Montloſier, a French emigrant, formerly the publiſher of a royaliſt journal, "Les Actes des Apôtres," and of late returned from London, to ſet up a new Courier de Londres, containing a kind of official bulletin, which frequently made war againſt the Engliſh newſpapers. The editor of the genuine Courier de Londres became more daring after that time, and Bonaparte often demanded his puniſhment from the Engliſh miniſtry. A formal proceſs was at laſt inſtituted at London againſt Peltier, which ended in his triumph. His journal, together with all Engliſh newſpapers, were prohibited at Paris, and the police watches againſt their importation with incredible but fully effectual aſſiduity.

"The official, and demi-official papers, the "*Moniteur*," and the "*Défenseur de la Patrie*," publiſhed by Bourienne, Bonaparte's private ſecretary; "the Bulletin de Paris," under the direction of the counſellor of ſtate, Regnaud St. Jean d'Angely; the "Journal of Paris," under the direction of Rœderer, were all fully employed, in contradicting and refuting the reports which had been ſpread during the concealment and abſence of Bonaparte. The Britiſh parliament was not ſpared in the leaſt, though the negotiations of peace had already commenced at Amiens. The Moniteur thought the Britiſh repreſentatives of the people *a ſet of Tartars*, and found in their ſpeeches nothing but childiſh diſcuſſions. He often taxed them with ſtupidity, abſurdity, ridicule, &c. All the underling papers eagerly copied theſe *judicious remarks* from the Moniteur.

A certain paper, called La Clef du Cabinet, which had attempted to take the airs of an oppoſition paper, began to notice theſe abſurd proceedings; but he was ordered to keep ſilence. A journal called Decade Philoſophique, which uſed to inſert an article under the title "*Les Affaires de l'Interieur*," was commanded to omit it in future. A muſical entertainment called, "La partie de chaſſe de Henry IV." that had been got up with great expence, received the Conſular Interdict, on account of ſome verſes in honour of their moſt beloved Henry, and his deſcendants. M. Texier, taking advantage of this prohibition, announced it for his public readings; but was commanded to leave out the offenſive verſes. M. Panou went ſo far, as to offer ſome general advice in his journal "Mentor à Corinthe," which greatly militated againſt Bonaparte's projects. He, the publiſher, and the printer, were all taken up: the printer had all his preſſes ſeized, and formally confiſcated by the police. The publiſher loſt all the copies of this truly harmleſs production, without receiving any equivalent. The author was deported to Cayenne.

"A young and merry poet, M. Dupaty, narrowly eſcaped a ſimilar fate. In a ſatyrical play written by him, he had made a little too free with the awkwardneſs and arrogance of the new ruler, and his truſty ſervants. He was ſent to Breſt in conſequence of an expreſs order from the Firſt Conſul,

who was already incenſed againſt him, on account of his being the jovial companion of his brother Lucien, then in diſgrace. He was to be tranſported to St. Domingo, on board the firſt ſhip, to ſhew his bravery againſt negroes and mulattoes. Happily for him the two brothers were reconciled before ſuch a veſſel ſailed; and he was pardoned for a few months' impriſonment. Thus every one was ſtruck with fear and terror, and all Paris reſounded with praiſes and bleſſings on the Firſt Conſul."

The author is miſtaken in one point. M. de Montloſier was not the publiſher of "Les Actes des Apôtres;" but Mr. Peltier. We know Montloſier well; he publiſhed a royaliſt journal in London, entitled *Journal de France*; and occaſionally wrote for *this Review*, though now, (alas! how fallen!) a baſe paraſite of Buonaparté! We ſhall extract ſome other remarks on the Firſt Conſul's conduct, in reſpect of the preſs, after he had ſecured, from his venal and trembling ſenate, the Conſulate for life.

"The famous Madame de Stael, the daughter of M. Necker, a lady of real genius, and poſſeſſed of conſiderable property, who had attracted the particular notice of Bonaparte, by the freedom which ſhe took in her writings, was ſent away from France; and Benjamin Conſtant, a Swiſs, of ſound underſtanding, and a good writer, ſhared the ſame fate. Madame de Stael, perhaps, owed this treatment to a late work of her father's, publiſhed under the title of "Dernieres vues de Politique," which deſervedly cenſures the mixture of a monarchical and republican government, introduced by Bonaparte, in order to blind the French, and to cover his deſigns.

"Whilſt Bonaparte was thus clearing his way, a journal was ſet on foot, to combat all former principles of liberty, equality, &c. It was the vile production of the infamous Barrere, who directed its baſe attacks chiefly againſt Condorcet and Camille Jourdan. It bore the title of "Journal de defenſeurs de la patrie," and ſtood under the ſpecial ſuperintendance of Fouché, then miniſter of police. This execrable Barrere, this cringing ſycophant, the villainous ſpeaking trumpet of all tyrants and raving monſters, who diſhonored the French revolution, is ſtill in the ſervice of government, and is the moſt active member of an inquiſitorial court, inſtituted againſt men of letters and learning. He ſerved all parties alike; but, when the deciſive moment arrived, he always turned; and, by this ſhameful verſatility and groſs infamy, he has eſcaped all ſentences of deportation paſſed againſt him. Who knows, whether he has not two different ſpeeches quite ready in his deſk, teeming both with curſes or bleſſings on Bonaparte, as was the caſe in the time of Robeſpierre; but I fear the preſent deſpot will hardly give him an opportunity; for, whatever Bonaparte may do, and how pliant ſoever the French may appear, he will never think himſelf ſo far ſecure, as to relax an inſtant in his moſt anxious cares for his perſonal ſafety."

On the mode of obtaining the votes of the *people* in favour of this new elevation of the foreign upſtart, who had already ſeized upon the ſupreme power of the ſtate, the author's obſervations are ſufficiently juſt.

"Books, for the lovers of *flouriſhing*, were opened in the mean time. Several military and judicial manœuvres were uſed to entrap votes. This collecting

collecting of the voice of the people by inſcriptions on liſts, is, indeed, a genuine invention: every body may ſign them, when he pleaſes, where he pleaſes, as often as he pleaſes, and under any name he pleaſes. The liſts are cloſed, and no one can find out when, where, and how. The only thing which muſt aſtoniſh, is the incredible diſpatch with which the true contents of an amazing number of different ſpecial liſts are brought to public knowledge."

When Buonaparté was waited upon by the ſlaves which compoſed his ſervile ſenate, with the decree which appointed him Conſul for life, he was rather taken by ſurprize, and not having the gift of ſpeech, haſtily drew a paper from his pocket, and read as follows: "*To the life of a Citizen his country has a juſt claim.*" (He forgot that *his* country was *Corſica.*) "*The French people demand that I ſhall devote myſelf to their ſervice; I obey their will. In giving me this new pledge of their confidence, they impoſe upon me the ſacred duty to eſtabliſh the ſyſtem of their laws on principles of wiſdom, liberty, equality; and the welfare of France will be ſecured againſt all future viciſſitudes.*" After this ſublime effuſion of Corſican gratitude, and a reciprocity of adulation and falſehood, the obſequious ſenate withdrew. As to their decree, the author truly obſerves, "It is a monſtrous thing; it entirely ſubverts the conſtitution, and renders the Firſt Conſul more abſolute than any of the princes throughout Europe." Of the *manners* of this low born upſtart, we here find a more juſt picture than we remember to have ſeen in any other publication.

"Every body ſtares with a ſlaviſh gaze at the Firſt Conſul, who treats them indiſcriminately in a dry, cold, and harſh manner. He ſometimes attempts to be polite or witty, but his politeneſs is a proud condeſcenſion, and his wit is ſatire. There is always ſomething rough or low in his way of expreſſing himſelf. He frequently makes uſe of terms, only to be found in the mouth of the upſtart ſoldier, and proſcribed by all good company. He is capable of uſing the moſt abuſive language with the greateſt indifference. The tone of his voice is deep and hoarſe, and what he ſays is often accompanied with ſuch a diſagreeable laugh, that nobody can feel eaſy with him, even when he attempts to ſay the moſt agreeable things.

The higheſt officers of ſtate muſt ſometimes hear themſelves addreſſed by epithets, which certainly never eſcaped the lips of a ſovereign. If he thinks he has caught one of his miniſters or privy counſellors in ſomething contradictory, he frequently ſays, "*vous etes un homme de mauvaiſe foi*;" or —"*vous me trompez.*—(You are a man not to be truſted—you cheat me.)

"He uſes no reſtraint in this reſpect with his own wife. He can publicly addreſs her in the ſevereſt manner, if, by chance, he do not approve of her dreſs and deportment, as being too free, too improper, or unbecoming. The beautiful Mad. Tallien, the intimate friend of Mad. Bonaparte, when once, after a ſomewhat long abſence of her huſband, ſhe appeared in a viſible ſtate of pregnancy in her ſaloon, which was full of company, ſhe was aſked by him, quite loud and ſternly, how ſhe could dare to appear in this ſtate before his wife! and he then ordered her inſtantly to leave the room.

"The preſent wife of M. Talleyrand, who is reported not always to have acted the part of a rigid prude, when Mad. Grand, was complimented by him, at her firſt introduction into the circle of Mad. Bonaparte, in the following manner:—"*J'eſpere, que Mad. Talleyrand, ſera oublier*

Madame Grand." The poor woman is ſaid to have anſwered in the greateſt confuſion—" that ſhe would always be proud to follow the example of Mad. Bonaparte."—If Mad. Talleyrand had been looked upon as a lady of parts, her anſwer might have been thought a witty one.

" When the principal ſingers at the opera, who had performed Haydn's oratorio of the Creation on the evening after the exploſion of the infernal machine, went to him in a body, to expreſs their joy on his eſcape, he ſaid to them—" *vous avez chanté comme des cochons.*"

" At the diſſolution of the national inſtitute, when it was again divided into the four old academies, and the latter refuſed to receive among them as members thoſe muſicians and players who had been admitted to the inſtitute, Bonaparte ſaid to one of them—" *les mathématiciens vous jetteront le pot de chambre ſur la tête, ils ne veulent plus de vous.*"

" Even the foreign ambaſſadors, who are reſpected in all civilized courts as the repreſentatives of their ſovereign's perſon, can never think themſelves ſecure againſt his offenſive and injurious language, neither at the levee, nor at Mad. Bonaparte's galas.

" The Britiſh and Swediſh ambaſſadors have frequently experienced his rudeneſs and ill-humour during laſt winter; and, if he even choſe to ſay any thing agreeable, it was generally directed to another, ſtanding near, to whom he owed a grudge."

This man ſeems determined to afford a complete verification of the old adage:—" Set a beggar on horſeback and he'll ride to the Devil."

" He ventured one evening, when only a ſmall party aſſembled at Madame Bonaparte's, to dance with his dear ſtep-daughter, Madame Lucien: he performed rather awkwardly, as this was the firſt attempt of the kind—ſo moſt likely will it be the laſt. Even on this merry occaſion, he found an opportunity of ſhewing his deſpotic and unfeeling heart. When it came into his head to dance, he took off his ſword and offered it the next by-ſtander, without looking at him. This by-ſtander happened unfortunately to be an officer of rank, who thought it againſt the point of honour to accept it, and therefore ſtepped back to wait till one of the ſervants might come and take it. Bonaparte then looked at this officer ſternly, and ſaid, in a terrible hoarſe kind of voice, " *Mais oui! je me ſuis bien trompé.*" He then made a ſign to a general, on whoſe readineſs he could depend, and gave him the ſword, which he ſnatched with great eagerneſs. When the too punctilious officer returned home, he already found an order, by which he was directed to depart on the next day for St. Domingo. A young officer is reported to have ſhared the very ſame fate, on account of his being too merry, and imprudently jumping upon the Firſt Conſul's foot."

No wonder that the author, after detailing ſuch flagrant inſtances of brutality and deſpotiſm, ſhould break out into the following reflection.

" If the daring, and hitherto fortunate uſurper, be not the moſt artful, not the moſt watchful among the inſidious, not the quickeſt to puniſhment among the revengeful; he will not be ſecured againſt the embrace of a treacherous Judas, who may give the ſignal for his deſtruction. Nay, be he ever ſo obſervant, ſtill he may, in the pretended embrace, meet his doom.—Dreadful exiſtence!"

Some

Some truly ridiculous inſtances of the awkward flattery beſtowed by the miſerable ſlaves of France, on their deteſtable tyrant, are here recorded; and ſupply a ſtrong proof that the French are as much degenerated in their adulation as in their humanity, ſince the reign of liberty and equality was eſtabliſhed. Indeed they are ſuch as would fully juſtify the application of Dr. Johnſon's rational remark on *Engliſh* flatterers to the heroes of the great nation, with the alteration of only a ſingle word.

"Strain out with *vacant impudence* a lye,
And gain a kick for awkward flattery."

Surely the Norman orator of Beauvais, who addreſſed the "little, meagre, yellow figure" of the Corſican, as "*the French Hercules*," and who talked of his "*omnipotent graces*," of his "*virtues*," and of "the *inexhauſtible goodneſs of Heaven, of which you are the moſt ſeducing image*," moſt richly deſerved ſuch a reward!

According to this writer, the French army have no more pay, than they had under the monarchy, though the price of proviſions now is treble what it was then. Their daily pay is only *two-pence halfpenny* Engliſh, and a pound and a half of bread; and there is no difference between the infantry and cavalry. And they are as badly clothed as paid. In September, 1803, the French army amounted to more than half a million of men, excluſive of the invalids, who garriſoned the different towns and forts. The old militia ſyſtem has been aboliſhed, and the more ſummary mode of raiſing men, as *conſcripts*, ſubſtituted in its place.

"Thus, by annihilating the militia, by undermining and aboliſhing the juries, by deſtroying all liberty of the preſs, Bonaparte has broken down the bulwarks of a free conſtitution; and, inſtead of a well-regulated monarchical government, founded on law, he has jumbled together a ſet of regulations, the reſult of his arbitrary will, which may be altered every day at pleaſure, which pave the way to the moſt ſcandalous bribery throughout all public offices; and thus deprives every body of the legal means of reſiſting injuſtice.

"Violent meaſures alone will ſtem the torrent of theſe glaring oppreſſions, which far exceed every thing, that the moſt depraved monarchical government ever did: yet Bonaparte, thus overwhelming a nation already the unhappy victim of the horrors of revolution and anarchy, is preparing new commotions; and he certainly has great reaſon to fear for his ſafety, and rules with a rod of iron.

"In ſpite of all his domeſtic meaſures, he will ſtill have a very precarious exiſtence, if he continue, as he has hitherto done, to irritate the people by his boundleſs partiality for his relations and favorites, which he ſo imprudently and inconſiderately manifeſts. Few will perhaps blame the man in power, when he endeavours to benefit his family, within the limits of prudence and moderation; but to grant to a numerous family, who are abſolute ſtrangers to the country, whatever the moſt extravagant vanity, and the moſt greedy appetite may crave to give; not from his own limited income, but from the public purſe, thus forfeiting all claim to perſonal ſacrifice and generoſity; to beſtow all the moſt lucrative places in adminiſtration

ſtration on ſwarms of brothers, brothers-in-law, uncles, couſins, &c. &c. without any regard to talents or character, to load them with ſeveral offices at the ſame time; to dub them preſidents in all public aſſemblies; to truſt them with the management of every thing, by which a great and immenſe profit may excluſively be reaped:—All this far exceeds every papal, princely, and miniſterial ſtretch of power, hitherto known in the world. Every thing will in time be forced to yield to this partiality of the Conſul, and the old Roman imperial deſpotiſm will ſink under the arrogance and tyranny of the new ruler.

"The ſeveral members of the family ſhew as little reſtraint and modeſty in the public enjoyment of all theſe advantages, as he exhibits in beſtowing them."

The author then gives a brief ſketch of the characters and profuſion of the reſpective members of this hopeful family; but as we took ſuch ample notice of them in our review of the *Revolutionary Plutarch*, we ſhall paſs them over here. Of Buonaparté's *fears* he exhibits the following notable inſtances.

"The greateſt precaution for his ſecurity is viſible on theſe excurſions. He never takes that road which has been previouſly announced. His guards are always ſent in ſeveral directions to wait for him, but are never certain which way he is to come. He never ſtays at a place ſo long as was at firſt expected. He always ſets out ſuddenly and unperceived, and generally arrives unobſerved in the night, at St. Cloud, or Malmaiſon. A ſalute from the guns announce on the next morning his return: meſſengers and couriers are riding in all directions, to inform the foreign ambaſſadors and the conſtituted authorities, that the *great maſter* is ready to accept at a certain hour their congratulations on his arrival."

With great truth the author obſerves, that "bold enterprizes, ſplendid and uncommon ſucceſſes, triumphs which give a luſtre to that vain and ambitious nation—theſe, while they exalt the proud ruler, are the only means by which his uſurped authority can ever be preſerved." He then adverts to his inſolent treatment of Lord Whitworth, which he imputes, not to any ſudden effuſion of ſpleen or anger, but to deſign; and, in confirmation of the opinion which *we* delivered on the concluſion of the treaty of Amiens, confidently aſſerts, that "he was certainly not earneſt in his deſire of a laſting peace;" and he forms a correct eſtimate of the Corſican's reaſoning, when he "believed the proud Iſlanders ſufficiently humbled by the diſadvantageous and diſhonourable terms of the treaty, which he had compelled them to accede to." The French preſs, at this period, was let looſe upon theſe humbled Iſlanders. "An Engliſh newſpaper, under the title of "The Argus," publiſhed by a Jew "(Mr. Lewis Goldſmith)" who had been driven away from England, was filled with the greateſt ſcurrility, and the moſt infamous aſperſions on the Engliſh people and government." This paper was given to all the Engliſh who now flocked to Paris, and its contents were ſpread through France, through the medium of the French papers. "No Engliſh newſpaper was publicly allowed, but one called *The Weekly Meſſenger*,

Meſſenger, which was evidently in the pay of the French government, and always in contradiction with the ſpirit of other Engliſh papers." Our readers may recollect that we apprized them of this fact at the time. That paper was then conducted by an Italian, *Badini*, who, in conſequence of an application from us to the Secretary of State, was ſent out of the country, under the Alien Act.

After all the horrors which we have witneſſed, ſince the abolition of monarchy in France, it is moſt lamentable to hear, which is no doubt true, that "very few Frenchmen are able to account to themſelves why the revolution began, and for what object they have undergone all the troubles and horrors of the laſt fifteen years."

The author appears to have formed a very juſt notion of the French character:—

"That a people, who were formerly and deſignedly permitted to ſpeak and to abuſe, if they only paid, and were obedient—who were chatterers and reaſoners by nature—who made witticiſms, vaudevilles, and epigrams, on every occaſion; that they ſhould now bridle ſprightlineſs and wit to ſo far, as not to allow themſelves, during three years, to write an epigram or ballad on the conſular government and Bonaparte, though ſeveral may be circulated in private, is certainly worthy of remark. It proves that he, who ſeverely puniſhed every paſquinade on the ſpot, has choſen the proper method to reſtrain this inclination. It proves that the ſpirit of the nation, which would give vent in former times to their vivacity and humour, in ſpite of the baſtile and the "lettres de cachets," is entirely broken down by fear. By ſelfiſhneſs, and love of pleaſure, they have loſt all courage, firmneſs, and reſolution. This want of energy has diſplayed itſelf throughout the whole revolution: for inſtance, has there ever been a ſingle man, among all thoſe, who drew a thouſand plans, who made a thouſand attempts to ſave and to diſengage the royal family, on whoſe welfare and life the whole exiſtence of the nobility and the whole army ſeemed to depend—has there ever been one, who has had courage and reſolution to hazard his life in the defence of the unhappy family? From Lafayette and Bouillé, down to the lieutenant who commanded the dragoons at the inn near the frontiers, where the royal ſufferers were detained; nay, even down to Santerre, who forced himſelf upon them as a protector, they all ſhrunk at the deciſive moment, inſtead of diſplaying that manly firmneſs, and venturing their life, to ſtrike the minds of the people with ſome heroic deed, and animating them with zeal for their monarch by their glorious example. By far the greateſt part of the national aſſembly was againſt the death of their ſovereign. Some threatening manœuvres of the daring party in the palace, and the populace, which had ſurrounded it it on the outſide, ſhortly before the nominal appeal, effected a majority of five votes for the death of the monarch. A million of inhabitants, who pitied their king, who ſhed tears at his fate, who were armed for defence and attack, baſely and cowardly ſuffered themſelves to be confined within their houſes by a handful of hired ſavages; they tamely ſuffered their beloved king to be executed, without any attempt to preſerve him.

"Such proofs of puſillanimity ſtamp them with ignominy; yet it is moſt ſupriſing, that the very ſame nation, thus far degraded and corrupted, ſtill exhibits the old inborn military ardour, and national love of glory of former

times. Many thouſands who quietly ſuffered themſelves to be guillotined, for fear of loſing an arm or a leg, would have marched undauntedly againſt an enemy, who had irritated them—they would, if their leader could have made it a point of honour, have climbed up batteries without hesitation—they would have borne the greateſt hardſhips with incredible patience."

Many curious inſtances are given of the ſcandalous corruption and bribery which prevail in every department of the government, one of which only we have room to inſert.

"A remarkable occurrence of this kind deſerves notice. A demand on government for ſeveral millions, due to ſome gentlemen near the Rhine, for proviſions and ſtores delivered to the army, had been made, and applied for through all the cuſtomary legal channels without ſucceſs. The caſe was at laſt brought before Lucien Bonaparte. His opinion was aſked, whether the payment might be obtained without further delay, as in that caſe the creditors were willing to ſubmit to ſome deductions. Lucien, after a full inveſtigation of the ſubject, pronounced the demand to be a juſt one, and ſaid to the ſupplicant, "*Je m'en charge à cinquante pour cent, dans trois mois vous toucherez.*"* The debt was diſcharged, and Lucien, who had ſettled this payment with the Firſt Conſul and his miniſters, was a few millions the richer. The appointments of a ſenator, and a legiſlator, are certainly not to be compared with ſuch *pretty bargains.*"

The ſenſe of the original is not given in this note. It ſhould be thus tranſlated: "*I will ſee you paid in three months if you will give me fifty per cent. for my trouble.*"

The book concludes with an account of the judicial proceedings of France, which are tyranny and injuſtice ſyſtematized; and with one more extract from this part of it we ſhall cloſe our account.

"There is alſo a kind of torture introduced for obſtinate priſoners, who will not confeſs according to the deſire of the judge. It is an invention worthy of Nero. The preſent prefect of the police, Dubois, who executes the will and orders of Bonaparte with more readineſs than Fouché did, has eſtabliſhed a new kind of gaol, ſo low and ſmall, that the priſoner can neither ſtand, ſit, nor lie down. He is thrown into theſe holes, and aſked every quarter of an hour, whether he will confeſs.

"A paſſionate Frenchman, naturally furious and light-headed, will certainly confeſs any thing to inculpate another man, on whom the government wiſhes to lay hold. It is no wonder then that this true Neronian invention finds advocates among the baſe hirelings of government; but that a tribune, a lawyer, and a philoſophical writer, ſhould defend it as a neceſſary remedy to bring the guilty to a confeſſion, as it lately appeared, is indeed aſtoniſhing.

"Liberal as the ſpecial tribunals may be with theſe arreſts, they find it ſometimes expedient to be equally liberal with the diſcharge of priſoners, in the courſe of the proceſs againſt them, if the priſoner ſhould happen to obtain the protection of men in power.

"A manufacturer of earthen-ware, a M. Fourmy, living in the Rue de

---

* You ſhall be paid in three months, fifty per cent (meaning diſcount.)

la Pepiniere, at Paris, was impriſoned and diſcharged in this manner. He had bought the houſe which he inhabited; but one of the judges in the ſpecial tribunals at Paris, who had lent a ſum of money to the vender on the ſecurity of the houſe, wiſhed to purchaſe it alſo. The notary who had made the contract, had named ſeveral perſons who might have a claim upon it, and whoſe conſent was therefore required, or who muſt firſt be ſatisfied, but he had not mentioned them all. The incenſed judge looked upon this as a "falſum," or cheat, and ordered the vender to be taken up. Some months after, when the witneſſes had been properly examined, the judge flew in a paſſion, becauſe the purchaſer had not been impriſoned, and had him ſeized likewiſe. Fortunately for the two priſoners, M. Fourmy knew the miniſter Chaptal, and Fourcroy the counſellor of ſtate, who eſteemed him on account of his knowledge in chemiſtry. M. Fourmy applied to them, and both vender and purchaſer were ſet at liberty without farther trouble."

The author has pledged himſelf to record the future actions of Buonaparté with faithfulneſs and impartiality; and we truſt he will fulfil his promiſe for the benefit of future times.

Hill's *Synonymes of the Latin Language.*

(*Continued from P.* 183.)

DR. HILL's diſquiſition on the prepoſition *cum*, though rather verboſe, is well conducted. But we copy the following nice remarks on *de*, with a requeſt that either the profeſſor himſelf, or ſome of our learned readers, will do us the favour to explain them.

"When *De* and *A* refer to different perſons, mentioned in the ſame ſentence, the former denotes the ſubject of diſcourſe, and the latter, the perſon from whom the intelligence comes. 'Credas non *de* puero Scriptum, ſed *a* puero.' PLIN. The writer is more nearly connected with the perſon addreſſed than ſpoken of, when theſe are different. Beſides, the means of information, in reſpect to the latter, come only from the former; and the prepoſition, expreſſing ſeparation moſt readily effected, is naturally made to ſpecify its immediate force. In the caſe of the prepoſition '*a*,' it will be found that the body which parts, is extraneous, with reſpect to the ſubject, from which the motion commences; while in that of *de* it may be contained in it. Of courſe, the ſeparation, ſuggeſted by the latter, is held more difficult, as a barrier is to be overcome, or the general coherence of a maſs conquered." (P. 267.)

"When, in Latin, the ſubject of thought is preſented as coming from a particular point, as its cauſe, the ſame relation is, in Engliſh, preſented by ſurrounding bodies pointing towards that ſubject, as the centre of a circumference, of which each is a part. This relation, accordingly, is *translated* [expreſſed] by the words 'about,' or 'in reſpect to.' 'Quid *de* Publio Clodio fiat, reſcribe.' CIC. *Ep. ad Att.* 2. 5. In Latin, Clodius is the ſuppoſed point, from which that conduct, which *was* the cauſe of Cicero's curioſity, proceeds: and in Engliſh, he is one of the many points bearing upon that conduct as a centre." (P. 268.)

To us this explanation is perfectly unintelligible; and we muſt ſuppoſe that Dr. Hill underſtands Cicero's requeſt in a different ſenſe from that which we affix to it. Its literal meaning we take to be this: "Inform me what is doing about Publius Clodius." If ſo, then, according to the Engliſh expreſſion, Clodius is ſo far from being *one of the many points bearing upon that conduct which was the cauſe of Cicero's curioſity, as a centre*," that he is himſelf the centre upon which that conduct bears.

The prepoſition *erga* is well explained. It "denotes," ſays Dr. Hill, "the direction and tendency of gentle affection, from one perſon to another, and has no reference to the motion of material ſubſtances." (P. 320.) He juſtly cenſures Cornelius Nepos for "applying it to the tranſmiſſion of a ſentiment of hatred;" and Plautus, for uſing it "as equal to *contra*, that is, as denoting ſituation, from oppoſition to ſome known object in ſpace."—"Odio quod *erga* regem ſuſceperant." Nep. in Dat. 10. "Tonſtricem Syram Noviſti noſtram, quæ modo *erga* ædes habet." Plaut. Truc. 2. 4. 52. Neither of theſe expreſſions ſeems to be pure.

The prepoſitions *e* and *ex* are alſo, on the whole, very well diſcuſſed. But in ſome of his obſervations on *in*, our author becomes again extremely metaphyſical; and accordingly theſe obſervations are, as uſual, of little value. What uſeful inſtruction, for inſtance, is derived from the pompous parade of metaphyſical refinement diſplayed in the paſſage which is here ſubjoined.

"As every object is naturally quieſcent, and is put in motion by the action of a cauſe that is extraneous, *and does not necessarily exist* [we ſhould have thought that whenever motion is produced, the cauſe of that motion muſt neceſſarily exiſt], ſo, the primary ſignification of *in*, is reſt in a place. Prior to the motion of any body, its ſituation is defined only by things in its own vicinity. As ſoon as the motion commences, and as long as it endures, new relations are taking place in reſpect to the ſurface over, or the medium through, which it is performed, and to the object to which the motion of the body is directed, and at which it is to ceaſe. This laſt, which is the quieſcent object, retains its relation to the ſpot [which] it occupied, and, beſides, furniſhes a ſubject for a new relation with another, moving towards, and about to enter it" (P. 429.)

This learned diſcuſſion, though we think it nugatory, is capable, however, of being underſtood. But the following paragraph is to us, at leaſt, "as dark as Erebus."

"But the idea of incloſure within a ſpace, having fixed boundaries of its own, is extended to that of one, whoſe limits are determined by the number of objects occupying it. In this caſe *in* becomes equal to 'inter,' and is tranſlated 'among.' In both caſes, the ſeparation of the correlative from all other objects is equally complete, as in both the line of diviſion is ſufficiently explicit. 'Byzantio expugnato, cepiſſet complures Perſarum nobiles, atque, *in* his, nonnullos regis propinquos.' Nep. *in Paus.* 2. The relations of the king are excepted from the Perſian nobility, who made up the aggregate of the captives, and this exception is founded upon the idea of a ſeparation

ſeparation being made between a part, and the rest, composing the whole. So alſo, in the following example: "Hic *in* viris magnis non eſt habendus." Cic. *de Off.* (P. 429,)

In the firſt place, with regard to this paſſage, we cannot help wondering by what particular train of aſſociation the learned Profeſſor was led to connect the idea of ſeparation with *in* In the ſecond place, we wonder ſtill more at his ſaying that "the relations of the king are *excepted* from the Perſian nobility. To us, on the contrary, the former appears to be evidently included among the latter. And, in the third place, it is not perfectly clear of what the learned Profeſſor ſuppoſes a whole to be compoſed: whether of *a part*, or of *the reſt*, or of *a part and the reſt together*.

"JUXTA," ſays Dr. Hill, "from 'jungere,' expreſſes nearneſs, *without reaching to contact*, and denotes the relation of vicinity borne by two objects that lie near to each other." (P. 482.) It cannot eſcape the obſervation of our readers, that the foregoing ſentence contains a groſs tautology; and they will probably be of opinion with us, that Dr. Hill is miſtaken in ſuppoſing that *juxta* excludes the notion of contact. His firſt example is, "Sepultus eſt juxta viam Appiam, ad quintum lapidem, NEP. and he comments on it thus: "The diſtance between the ſepulchre and the Appian way is more vaguely ſtated by means of *juxta*, than that between the city and the mileſtone is by '*ad*,' though the former was by much the ſmalleſt," This ſhort ſentence diſplays a moſt unaccountable inaccuracy of thought. The *ad* has nothing to do with the diſtance between the city and the mileſtone. That diſtance, if ſtated at all, is ſtated by *quintum*, not by *ad*. Our author's next example is from Tacitus, de Mor. Ger. 17. "Totos dies *juxta* focum atque ignem agunt."—"The natural ſluggiſhneſs of the Germans," he obſerves, "led them to keep nearer the fire than men of a contrary diſpoſition would have done, merely to counteract the effects of the cold." Then follows one of thoſe notable, profound, remarks with which we are frequently treated by Dr. Hill. "A certain nearneſs, however, would have been noxious to their animal frame."

Of the author's remarks on the uſes of *ob* we have not room to inſert a ſpecimen; though ſome of them would, doubtleſs, very greatly gratify the curioſity of our readers, being founded on the learned gentleman's knowledge of optics, and on the modern diſcovery "that light actually paſſes from the object to the eye." (P. 544.) With regard to *per*, the radical meaning of which is *through*, our author thus accounts for that uſe of it in which it may be tranſlated by between. "Surfaces, which, from being contiguous in appearance, are held to be but one, are divided by the correlative object. As being actually two, the Engliſh ſay that a body paſſes between them; and as ſeeming to be but one, this body is ſaid, by the Latins, to pierce or paſs through them." (P. 576.) Of this laſt ſentence it is obvious, that it does not expreſs what Dr. Hill meant to ſay; for it really ſtates *the*

Engliſh

Engliſh as being *actually two*, and *this body as ſeeming to be but one.* The idea, however, is ſufficiently quaint: and the author's example does not, we think, agree very well with his theory.

> " Has " inter" mediamque duæ mortalibus ægris
> Munere conceſſæ divûm, et via ſecta *per* ambas,
> Obliquus qua ſe ſignorum verteret ordo.
>
> VIRG. GEORG. 1. 237.

Theſe lines are, by the learned Profeſſor, thus explained. " The temperate zones are here ſuppoſed to make their way between the torrid zone and the frigid on each ſide of it, which three would otherwiſe have come together, and have occupied the whole ſurface of the earth." But, in the firſt place, are the ſurface of the torrid zone, and thoſe of the frigid zones on each ſide of it, ſo contiguous in appearance as to be " held to be but one?" In the ſecond place, if this explanation applies, at all, to the uſe of *per* in Virgil, it is certain that the learned Profeſſor miſunderſtands the poet. For the " via ſecta *per* ambas," does not mean the temperate zones, ſeparating the torrid zone from the frigid on each ſide of it, but the Zodiac.

Præ is ſaid, by Dr. Hill, to differ from *pro* " in two reſpects; both as it neceſſarily implies motion in the objects, expreſſed by the governed and the correlative terms, and as, in its original power, it neceſſarily ſuppoſes both to be animated." (P. 606.) Both theſe diſtinctions we believe to be fanciful That *præ* is often applied to objects in motion is true, but not we think neceſſarily. Nor do we think it at all more eſſential, that both the objects ſhould be animated. Some of our author's own examples, indeed, belie his principles. " Romam præ ſuâ Capuâ, irridebunt atque contemnent."—CIC. *contra Rull.* 85. b. " Si Cæſaris liber *præ* manibus eſt, promi jubeas." AUL. GELL. 19. 8. Neither *liber* nor *Capua*, ſurely, is animated.

The application of *præ* to denote the cauſe, is, it ſeems, ſomewhat difficult. " Non, medius fidius, *præ* lacrymis poſſum reliqua nec cogitare, nec ſcribere." CIC. *Ep. ad Att.* 148.

" In commenting upon this paſſage," ſays our author, " and illuſtrating the principle upon which the prepoſition ſo uſed operates, the critical acuteneſs of Geſner ſeems to have forſaken him. The tears, he ſays, prevented Cicero from ſeeing, by being before his eyes, and thus making it impoſſible for him to write. To a philoſophic grammarian of leſs ability it ſhould have occurred, that the tears, by being the governed, neceſſarily form the poſterior object in the train, and that nothing in the ſmalleſt degree ſatisfactory can be inferred from their local ſituation, in reſpect to the eye, that emits them."

Geſner's ſolution is, unqueſtionably, viſionary; but we do not think that of Dr. Hill more ſolid. " The cauſe and the effect are, in this uſe," he ſays, " underſtood to go in train, and the precedency of the former ſhould naturally give exiſtence to the latter. By a metonymy, however, the one is ſubſtituted for the other, and the object expreſſed by the governed word, which is, in reality, the cauſe, is made

made ſubſequent to that, which in nature it precedes.——The metonymy deſtroys the neceſſary antecedency of the cauſe, and ſubſtitutes the effect in its place." This is merely amuſing us with words inſtead of things. We have no predilection for ſuch a method of explaining the principles of language. Theſe, we are convinced, are among all men, whether civilized or ſavage, founded in certain natural laws of human thought. It is eaſy, indeed, when we meet with an expreſſion which puzzles us, to call it a metonymy, a catachreſis, or a hyſteron-proteron. But this is, in reality, explaining nothing. Our object ſhould be to catch, if we can, the train of conception which originally gave riſe to it. If the Romans inverted the natural connection between cauſe and effect, they, certainly, were not like other men; and ſure we are, that they never ſyſtematically thought of doing ſo on the abſurd rhetorical fiction of a metonymy. Our idea, which we merely give as a conjecture, is that, in this uſe of *præ*, the cauſe is conceived as being behind, and puſhing on the effect before it. This mode of conception is perfectly analogous to that ſuggeſted by *præ* when joined with words denoting motion. "Hercules—*præ* ſe armentum agens." Liv. I. 7. So, preciſely, the following expreſſion of Terence, "Credo, ut ſit, miſera, *præ* amore, excluſiſti hunc foras" might be exactly rendered as follows: "*Love drove you* to ſhut him out of doors." The learned Profeſſor's diſſertation on *præter* is, in our eſtimation, a ſingular curioſity. "*Præter*," he ſays, "differs from *præ*, in ſuppoſing, that the object, expreſſed by the governed word, may or may not move; and that the correlative moves in a line, acroſs its path, if moving, and the line of its aſpect, if at reſt." (P. 611.) Thus our learned author ſtates, in general, the import of the prepoſition *præter*; but he afterwards condeſcends to give us information infinitely more minute. The following is a ſpecimen.

"The ſpecification made by 'Præ,' is more definite than that by *præter*, in the ſame way as we found that by 'In' more ſo than by 'Inter.' 'Præ' requires the correlative, and the governed object, to move in the ſame line, while *præter* admits the correlative to move, or be quieſcent, and only requires that it ſhall bear upon the path of the other, if moving, and on the line of its aſpect, if at reſt. This path may, beſides, be cut in an infinite variety of directions, by the object that croſſes it. While the motion of the correlative, then, in the caſe of 'Præ,' is confined to one path, from which it cannot deviate, the lines of its motion, in the caſe of *præter*, are innumerable, and ſubject to no limitation, but that of croſſing the lines of motion, or of aſpect, in the other, ſo as to form any poſſible angle with them."—(ibid.)

What a parade about lines, and angles, and aſpects! What a multitude of words to tell us a very plain truth, that *præter* gives notice of one object's going athwart or acroſs another! But all this is ſimplicity itſelf, compared with what follows.

"*Præter* is frequently taken to denote 'Contrary to,' or 'Againſt.' It muſt be obſerved, that the co-incidence which takes place in the lines of motion, between the two objects related by "Præ," is, in the caſe of *præter*,

ter, broken; and that it may be broken in a greater or a leſs degree. The direction is completely tranſverſe, when the correlative object croſſes the line of motion, or of aſpect, in the governed, at right angles. When the angle, formed by the object, going athwart the line, in which the governed directs its motion, or its aſpect, in one way, is as acute as poſſible, the lines of either become nearly oppoſite, and, in this view, *præter* is made to denote 'Againſt.' When the motion is thus performed, there exiſts the neareſt poſſible approach towards that relation between two objects, which is expreſſed by 'Ob,' or 'Contra." (P. 612.)

This learned diſquiſition, it muſt be allowed, is moſt mathematical. But the ingenious Profeſſor ought to have recollected that, without the aſſiſtance of ſenſible repreſentatives, mathematical diſquiſitions are extremely apt to become obſcure. And, in the preſent caſe, we are inclined to think that, in bare juſtice to his readers, it was his duty to have furniſhed them with an explanatory diagram. To conſtruct ſuch a diagram, we cannot conceive that ſo accompliſhed a geometer could have been at a loſs; but even had he found himſelf involved in any difficulties, he had only, we preſume, to apply to his learned brother, Mr. Profeſſor Playfair, who, we cannot doubt, would have very politely afforded him every aid in his power.

But, unleſs our judgment be extremely erroneous, Dr. Hill has moſt completely miſtaken the principle on which this uſe of *præter* is founded. To take one of his examples: Simo, in Terence (And. v. 3. 8.), condemns his ſon for wiſhing to marry a ſtranger, "*Præter* civium morem atque legem;" that is, "Contrary to the cuſtoms and laws of the city." At the mode of conception which gave riſe to the Latin expreſſion, we ſhall never arrive, by puzzling our brains with acute angles, or with lines of motion and of aſpect. The idea is the moſt natural and ſimple that can be imagined. It is preciſely that of "*tranſgreſſing* a law." In its literal meaning, we need hardly obſerve, *to tranſgreſs* a law is to "go *beyond* it:" and this is the very notion ſuggeſted by "*præter* civium morem atque legem." But this prepoſition can perform greater wonders ſtill.

"*Præter* is often to be tranſlated," ſays the Profeſſor, 'Except, or 'Beſide.' In this uſe it is underſtood, that the general line of motion, maintained by the correlative, croſſes that of one or a few of the governed objects, which laſt are thereby rendered ſingular, and are excepted from the general groupe. 'Omnibus ſententiis, *præter* unam, quam ſuam Stalenus eſſe dicebat, Scamander condemnatus eſt.'—Cic. *pro Cluent.* 28. b. The direct line in which the ſingle vote of Stalenus moved, was croſſed by thoſe of all other counſellors, and the former accordingly, is excepted from the reſt, as tending a different way."

This may be all very well, but what ſhall we make of the next example? "Amicum tibi ex conſularibus neminem eſſe video *præter* Lucullum." Cic. *Ep. Famil.* 5.

"Not one," ſays Dr. Hill, "of thoſe men, of conſular dignity, croſſed the line, in which Lucullus ſhewed his attachment to Lentulus. The ſentiment of Lucullus, accordingly, which was known to be amicable, is excepted

cepted from thoſe of the reſt, which, from having taken a direction different, and perhaps oppoſite, are underſtood to have been hoſtile."

How is this? Stalenus, becauſe *every body* croſſed the line of his ſentiment, is "rendered ſingular, and excepted from the reſt." Lucullus, becauſe *nobody* croſſed the line of his ſentiment, is placed in the very ſame ſituation; and *præter*, it ſeems, denotes equally well *to croſs the line* and *not to croſs it!*

The laſt of Dr. Hill's diſquiſitions concerning *præter*, is ſo very profound, that we do not, in the leaſt, pretend to underſtand it. Our readers, however, may be more fortunate; and we, therefore, lay it ſimply before them.

"This notion of exception may explain another power of *præter*, when it is uſed to denote 'Above,' 'more than.'

——ille hinc abeſt quem ego amo præter omnes.
PLAUT. *Amph.* 2. 2. 10.

"The object of the love is here excepted from all others, as enjoying a greater ſhare of it. The attachment to this favourite, and to all mankind beſides, flows in a different channel. If we tranſpoſe the prepoſition, thus, '*Præter* quem, ego amo omnes,' the excepting power prædominates, and the meaning inſtantly changes. The perſon, implied in the relative, who before enjoyed almoſt all the love, becomes the only perſon who enjoys none of it. From the extent of the excepted part, it ſeems, the mind draws different concluſions. When this part conſiſts of but one, or a few of thoſe individuals that make up the aggregate, the prepoſition denotes 'Beſide,' 'Except;' and when it conſiſts of a number, that amounts nearly to the whole, it denotes 'Above,' 'more than.' However oppoſite in appearance the two ſignifications may be, yet the principle by which the mind arrives at each is evidently the ſame." (P. 613.)

After the learned and philoſophical lore of Mr. Profeſſor Hill, our readers, we fear, will be apt to deſpiſe any little information which our plain experience, in the peruſal of the Roman Claſſics, may have ſuggeſted to us. We ſhould, certainly, otherwiſe be tempted to ſay that nothing can be more plain than the meaning of the Latin prepoſition *præter*. In our opinion it ſeems merely to ſignify *paſſing by*; and we are not yet convinced, by all our learned author's metaphyſics and mathematics, that he who takes this idea along with him will miſs the ſenſe of any paſſage, in as far, at leaſt, as *præter* is concerned.

The learned Profeſſor occupies no fewer than five quarto pages in the explanation of *secundum*. (Pp. 688—693). He makes the radical idea of this prepoſition *vicinity*. This is ſo far from being the truth, that nothing can be conceived more fanciful. *Secundum* is from *ſequor*; and, in all its applications, gives the idea of *following*. Even the Engliſh idiom will, almoſt always, admit of its being ſo tranſlated. Examples might eaſily be given from every one of Dr. Hill's ſeven meanings of this prepoſition. But we are under the neceſſity of haſtening to *Sub*, which furniſhes an article peculiarly rich.

The firſt paragraph of this article is, to our apprehenſion, a tiſſue

of

of moſt inextricable confuſion. "SUB," we are told, "denotes the relation which one object bears to another that is immediately above it." (P. 720.) What is the meaning of "*immediately* above it?" Theſe words might, poſſibly, be underſtood to ſignify that the two objects muſt be ſo placed that the ſame vertical plane may paſs through both of them. But the next ſentence ſeems to ſhew that this is not their ſenſe. "If the inferior body," ſay the learned author, "ſerves as a ſupport to a member above it, it is in the relation of *ſub* to that only, with which it is in contact, and not to the reſt, that are alike incumbent." Indeed! So, then, the loweſt ſtone in the corner of a wall is *not* under the higheſt! This, we apprehend, is new philoſophy. Yet, a little after, Dr. Hill informs us that "a perſon 'ſub dio,' that is, under the cope of heaven, is as much under it, as a perſon, who can juſt ſtand erect in a cave or a hut, is under its roof." He ſays, indeed, that "the ſupported body, like an arch, is not neceſſarily in contact with that under it, but may reſt upon others, which tranſmit the weight, and are themſelves alſo ſupported." This is, unqueſtionably true; but to us it appears to be in flat contradiction to what was ſaid before. The truth is, that the learned Profeſſor has here completely bewildered himſelf with the idea of *contact*, which, moſt evidently, does not, in any caſe, enter into our notion of the relation expreſſed by *ſub*.

Our learned author gives us ſeveral examples, in which "the ſupported body is not in contact with that ſaid to be under it." One of theſe is "manet *ſub* Jove frigido venator, teneræ conjugis immemor." —HOR. On this expreſſion he has the following remark, concerning which we leave our readers to decide whether it be characteriſtic of wiſdom or of folly. "The ſuperior body is not incumbent, but has only the appearance of being ſo." "But," continues our author, "the relation of nearneſs neceſſary to form that original one [we ſuppoſe that, by the *original one*, he means *contact*], in reſpect to the bodies 'above' and 'under,' is transferred to objects lying on the ſame ſurface. The idea of 'up' and 'down' is then abandoned, and the circumſtance, which is but an acceſſory in the radical meaning, becomes a principal in the uſe now explained." What abſurdity is this! The relation of nearneſs, which is *neceſſary* to form the *original* meaning of *ſub*, is yet but an acceſſory in its *radical* meaning! We have gotten ſuch a ſurfeit of radical refinement, that, we think, we ſhall be tempted to hate it for ever.

On the expreſſion of Terence, "agelli eſt hic *ſub* urbe paulum," our author obſerves, that "the ground here mentioned, was not under the city, but near it." How comes Dr. Hill to be ſo ſure of this? Great part of the city where Dr. Hill reſides is built, we have been informed, on very elevated ground. If ſo, the fields in its immediate vicinity are both *under* it and *near* it. The field, in Terence, our author alſo ſays, "was what the Latins called the *ſuburbium*, and we the *ſuburb*." Of the truth of this we have our doubts. We think that, neither in Latin nor in Engliſh, is the term ever applied to a field.

field. We shall copy the definition given of the word *suburbia*, by our old, respected, friend Adam Littleton. "Suburbia. Cic. Sunt frequentes extra urbem domus, instar vici urbani, qu. *sub urbe*; τα προαστια. The out-streets, and out-parishes of a town or city, the SUBURBS."

We do not, by any means, intend to assert that *sub* never conveys the idea of nearness. But we think that its original idea is simply that denoted by the English word *under*, and that the motion of nearness is superadded by inference. Thus what is "*sub* oculis," just under the eye, must necessarily, in general, be near. As towns were often anciently built on heights with a view to safety, the additional buildings in their neighbourhood would be *under* them.

When *sub* had acquired the power of giving notice of nearness in place, it was easy to apply it in the signification of nearness in time. "*Sub* idem tempus legati ad res repetendas missi."—LIV. 25. 24. "These ambassadors," our author obligingly tells us, "were not sent at the same time in which the correlative event took place; and it is uncertain whether it was a little before or a little after, THOUGH ONE OF THEM IT MUST HAVE BEEN." The last use of *sub*, he says, is to signify *during*. "Events are understood to last till an expected and necessary change take place within the space in which they occur:" Another wise remark. In this use, the preposition "is joined with an ablative alone." The Professor gives us three examples. The first is from Pliny, concerning which, as we have not that author at hand, we can say nothing. The second is from Virgil:

——Somno positæ, *sub* nocte silenti
Lenibant curas, et corda oblita laborum.

ÆN. 4. 523.

The idea here is certainly that of these animals sleeping *under*, the night as a covering. But our author's explanation of his third example unquestionably conveys a wrong idea. "The word," he says, "employed to mark the time during which the event lasts, is not always the measure of a regular and defined period, as in the instances given. 'Ne *sub* ipsa profectione milites oppidum irrumperent, portas obruit.' —CÆSAR, *Bel. Civ.* 1. 27. The word 'profectio,' here, refers to the time during which Cæsar might be in pursuit of Pompey, which would be longer or shorter, according to the difficulties [which] he encountered." (P. 724.) *Profectio*, however, has no reference at all to Cæsar's pursuit of Pompey; an idea which is altogether the creation of our author's own fancy; but simply to the departure of Pompey from Brundusium, as any one may see by consulting the passage. We shall here subjoin the judgment of the very learned Ruddiman concerning such passages. It is found in his Grammatica Major, p. 273. Note 9. "*Sub* autem cum ablativo pro *circa* vel *inter* accipitur; ut, Cæs. B. G. VIII. 49. *Sub discessu suo.* Id. B. Civ. 1. 27. *Sub ipsa profectione.* Pallad. Sept. 13. *Sub occasu Vergiliarum.* Suet. Ner. 541. *Sub exitu vitæ palam voverat.*"

in

In Dr. Hill's diſquiſition on the prepoſition *trans*, we have the following obſervation. "*Trans* does not always refer to the exiſting motion. It often denotes the point at which a prior motion terminated, and at which the body is quieſcent." (P 748.) This is exemplified by a ſentence from Cicero: 'Di am hunc eo tempore quo homo occiſus eſt, *trans* mare fuiſſe.'—*De Inv.* 52. a. "The perſon," ſays Dr. Hill, "in whoſe favour an *alibi* is affirmed, might have been on the ſame ſide of the ſea with the perſon killed, *when the crime was committed*, but may have afterwards gone acroſs it, and taken up his abode there." From this ſpecimen we are led to conſider it as fortunate that the learned Profeſſor was not bred to the law; for his clients would, we think, have been in eminent danger Cicero would have defended the perſon accuſed by affirming, as he himſelf informs us, that ſuch perſon was *beyond the ſea when the crime was committed.* Dr. Hill, on the contrary, would ſay, "My Lord, my client may NOT, indeed, have been beyond the ſea, when this crime was committed, though, to be ſure, he may have *afterwards* gone acroſs it, and taken up his abode there." And this defence, *ſi diis placet*, Dr. Hill denominates affirming an *alibi!*

Some of this author's ſpeculations with regard to *verſus* may be quoted as a ſignal ſpecimen of learned trifling, which, after all, has no foundation in truth. "When *verſus*," he tells us, "appears connected with a prepoſition, it changes its own nature, and becomes an adverb." (p. 754.) It is ſurely a ſtrange grammatical theory, which makes words change their *nature* by a ſort of magical inchantment. It is the refuge of ſuperficial minds alone, who, when they are puzzled by the particular application of a word; which application they are unable to trace to the natural and primitive ſenſe of the term; chooſe, rather than confeſs their own ignorance, to ſay that the term has changed its nature, and claſſed itſelf with a different ſpecies. But to proceed with Dr. Hill.

"It *(versus)* is then equal to the ſyllabic adjection 'wards,' in Engliſh, and renders the path of direction more vague than it would otherwiſe have been. 'Deductus in arcem in lapide ad meridiem *versus* conſedit.—Liv. l. 18. Were the prepoſition by itſelf, the aſpect of the perſon looking would be underſtood to be due ſouth; but, when modified by the adverb *versus*, a certain deviation from this line, *either one way or other*, is underſtood to take place. The *versus*, too, as an adverb, quits the neceſſary reference to motion, implied in it as a prepoſition, and poſſeſſes the third power of 'ad,' ſignifying 'toward.' The correlative object, in this caſe, either poſſeſſes the power of motion, without uſing it, or is, in its nature, always quieſcent."

Than theſe obſervations nothing can be more nugatory. *Verſus* may, indeed, be ſaid to imply motion, but not the motion intended by Dr. Hill. In the expreſſion of Cicero "quem Brunduſium *verſus* ires ad Cæſarem," quoted by him, the motion towards Brunduſium is denoted by *ires* and not by *verſus*. All the motion which is ever denoted by *verſus*, is that ſignified by the Engliſh word *turned*, which is indeed

indeed its literal tranſlation. Dr. Hill would have, therefore, been more correct if, inſtead of ſaying that *verſus* implies a neceſſary reference to motion towards a definite point, he had ſaid that it is univerſally ſignificant of *aſpect*. Thus the ſentence from Livy, quoted above, accurately means: "Being conducted into the citadel, he ſat down upon a ſtone, having his face turned to the ſouth.

We have been ſo long detained by Dr. Hill's propoſitions, that we muſt reſerve the remaining part of our remarks for another number.

(To be concluded in our next.)

Supplement to the Analyſis of Ariſtotle's ſpeculative Works; containing an Account of the Interpreters and Corrupters of his Philoſophy, in Connection with the Hiſtory of the Times, in which they reſpectively flouriſhed. By John Gillies, L. L. D. Cadell and Davies, Pp. 48. 4to. 1804.

IN our firſt volume we reviewed the Engliſh Ariſtotle of Dr. Gillies, and beſtowed high praiſe on the learning and ability which familiarized the ſoundeſt moral and political philoſophy of ancient Greece to a modern Engliſh reader. We remarked, that at all times the works of ſuch a Sage deſerved to be ſtudied; but that the verſion was peculiarly ſalutary, at a ſeaſon when the viſionary theories of ſcioliſts were ſo prevalent, and accompanied by the practical inculcations of revolutionary agitators. We expreſſed our ſatisfaction, that the talents and erudition of Dr. Gillies had made the moſt beneficial interpreter of Grecian philoſophy ſpeak Engliſh; and ſhewn, that in ancient, as in modern times, the moſt profound of ſages taught, that while there exiſt ſtrong and turbulent paſſions in the human mind, there muſt be a vigorous and efficient controul in every political ſyſtem which is intended to promote the welfare of ſociety. The doctrine of Ariſtotle is the doctrine of Socrates, Xenophon, Polybius, Cicero, Tacitus, Bacon, and Burke. To Britons we remarked the performance

"Muſt prove not only ſupremely uſeful, by ſo profoundly explaining the principles of Government, the excellence of thoſe which diſtinguiſh the land we live in, and our conſequent obligation to a ſtrenuous ſupport of our conſtitution; but, highly pleaſing, at it ſhews that the greateſt perfection of Government which the wiſeſt political philoſopher of antiquity, with the whole volume of hiſtory and human nature before his eyes, could conceive as poſſible to be attained by man, is that of which Britons feel and enjoy the bleſſings."

Wherever Ariſtotle appeared obſcure, Dr. Gillies endeavoured to explain his meaning, by making him a perpetual commentary on himſelf; inſtead of interpreting the Stagirite through the medium of commentators. The ſame ſound and diſtinguiſhing judgment, which enabled Dr. Gillies to perceive the excellence and utility of a great

part of Ariſtotle's philoſophy, diſcerned that every thing which he wrote was not equally valuable; and that certain doctrines which he thought worthy of diſcuſſion, muſt to modern readers appear very trifling. Of theſe the moſt noted are Platonic ideas, and Pythagorean numbers. In his Analyſis our interpreter had ſaid that Ariſtotle had examined thoſe doctrines with a degree of attention, of which they would appear altogether unworthy to the taſte and reaſon of the preſent age, "and (continues the doctor), from reſpect merely for the good ſenſe of the public, I abſtained from entering into any copious diſcuſſion of this uſeleſs and now deſpiſed ſubject." This proceeding excited great wrath in Mr. Thomas Taylor, who has publiſhed a tranſlation of Ariſtotle's Metaphyſics. That writer, inſtead of inveſtigating Ariſtotle himſelf, looks for his meaning in the works of his commentators; and maintained that the Stagirite's "firſt principles of the univerſe are no other than thoſe incorporeal cauſes called by Plato ideas;" and he pours out abuſive epithets againſt Dr. Gillies, *becauſe he differs from him in opinion.* Mr. Taylor diſcovers a notable defect in the preſent faſhionable mode of writing. The lamented evil is that *every author endeavours to adapt every ſubject to the apprehenſion of the meaneſt capacity.* We think that every modern author either does not make this attempt, or does not ſucceed, ſince many treatiſes are publiſhed that could not be underſtood by the greateſt capacities; if unintelligibility be one of the qualities of good writing, we congratulate Mr. Taylor as he certainly does not make himſelf underſtood.

Dr. Gillies entertains a different idea concerning perſpicuity; and alſo the perſpicuity of Ariſtotle. In his opinion thoſe doctrines, which Mr. Taylor, humbly imitating the commentators of Ariſtotle, called the ſublimeſt myſteries of Grecian philoſophy, may be eaſily explained by equivalent terms in intelligible Engliſh. By the Doctor's account, when Ariſtotle flouriſhed, the *numbers* of Pythagoras, and *ideas* of Plato, were conſtrued by many to be real ſubſtances; and one grand purpoſe of the Stagirite was to refute that doctrine. Ariſtotle conſidered all exiſtence as conſiſting of individuals; and general terms as appellations denominating many individuals of the ſame kind, but having no archetype in actual being. Our author tranſlates a chapter of Ariſtotle's Metaphyſics, which controverts and overturns the doctrine of Platonic ideas; and alſo cites a tranſlation of the ſame chapter by Mr. Taylor. In the verſion of Dr. Gillies, Ariſtotle ſpeaks ſound and perſpicuous ſenſe. In the verſion of Mr. Taylor, Ariſtotle ſpeaks unintelligible nonſenſe; and if an interpreter, who makes the wiſeſt of ancient philoſophers deliver nonſenſe and abſurdity as the reſult of his profound inveſtigation and deduction, render more juſtice to that philoſopher, than the interpreter, who makes him utter ſenſe and reaſon, then Mr. Taylor is a tranſlator much more worthy of Ariſtotle than Dr. Gillies. The analyſis of Ariſtotle's ſpeculative works, as exhibited by Gillies, repreſents the ſage as vindicating the exiſtence and nature of truth againſt the cavils of ſophiſts, and illuſtrating

trating this doctrine by a demonſtration of the being and unity of a God. Mr. Taylor denies this interpretation, ſo honourable to the Stagirite, and viewing the philoſopher, *through the comments of the Platonicians*, he endeavours to impute to him the contrary doctrines. MR. TAYLOR IS NOT AN INTERPRETER OF ARISTOTLE, *he merely repeats, at ſecond hand, the fancies and freaks of the Eclectics, or Platonicians* who flouriſhed in the declining periods of the Roman empire, when there appears to have been a relaxation of intellectual as well as moral energy; and when ſound ſenſe and vigorous reaſon gave way to ſophiſtical ſubtlety and fanciful viſions. The hiſtory of this ſect, in its connection with general literary and political hiſtory, Dr. Gillies very ably traces; and he demonſtrates Mr. Taylor to be a mere copyiſt of exploded errors.

Mr. Taylor ſeems to have acquired a verbal and grammatical knowledge of the Greek language. Thence he has fallen into a very common miſtake with linguiſts, that becauſe they happen to know the words of a tongue, they are therefore competent to a comprehenſion of all the learning and wiſdom that are contained in that tongue. Mr. Taylor really ſuppoſes himſelf a philoſopher; but hear we his own words, in which he boaſts himſelf to be much ſuperior to Dr. Gillies. "*Surely it is ſome evil genius in an evil hour, that tempted him to abandon hiſtory for philoſophy, and Herodotus for Ariſtotle. Touch not Hector; Hector is my due. Touch not the obſcurity of Ariſtotle; it is not to be vanquiſhed by you.*" A ſpecimen of more arrogant boaſting we do not recollect to have met in our employment of reviewers. At the ſame time, on conſidering certain departments of London literature, we are not ſurpriſed at any deviation from common propriety and common ſenſe. In this metropolis the manufacture of book-making is carried on in every mode that can be deviſed for employing paper and print, without learning or genius. Some handicraftſmen of this kind work ſingly; others job in clubs and knots. One undertakes a large quantity of work, which he parcels out to different hands; and they are paid by the piece. This *joint ſtock* kind of literature is in particular requeſt among the diſſenting tribe; and, indeed, not without good ſolid reaſon. If a concern be large, and none of the undertakers happen to have much capital of his own, they plauſibly argue, that a multiplicity of names may in ſome degree ſupply the want of names of any importance; as tradeſmen of doubtful credit endeavour to have their bills backed with many indorſements. All theſe *copartners in a literary manufacture, muſt praiſe each other, in order to promote the credit of the concern*; and if you were to hear one of theſe clubbing jobbers ſpeaking of another of the ſame fraternity, and to take the ſpeaker's word, you would ſuppoſe, a common, dull, pains-taking raker of repetitions, and compiler of old dictionaries, a profound and learned Doctor. Mr. Taylor, we apprehend, belongs, either by work, or democratical connection, or both, to ſome fraternity in the piece-work line, and may be accuſtomed to hear himſelf praiſed by others of the ſame caſt. *Democratic diſſenters*, we have

heard, repreſent him as a man of learning and ability; but we never heard him praiſed for either, by any one who is able and learned himſelf. But however profound a philoſopher, *his brethren* may ſuppoſe Mr. Taylor, or Mr. Taylor may ſuppoſe himſelf, Dr. Gillies has completely demonſtrated this boaſter to be totally ignorant of the philoſophy of Ariſtotle, and himſelf to be thoroughly maſter of the wiſdom of the Stagirite. Perfectly acquainted both with Plato and Ariſtotle, Dr. Gillies draws their reſpective and comparative characters in ſuch a manner as we think muſt be highly gratifying to our readers; and we ſhall therefore quote the paſſage for their peruſal. He had traced the notions and chimeras of the Platonicians from the time of Plato, through the Platoniſts, to the third century of the Chriſtian æra.

"From thoſe Platonicians (he proceeds) a ſpurious philoſophy, under venerable ancient names, was communicated to the idle loquacity of the Greeks of Conſtantinople, and by them finally diffuſed over the nations of the Eaſt and Weſt; among the Arabs, under the Abaſſides, in the eighth century, and at the revival of letters, among the Italians, and other nations of modern Europe. From the accounts which I have already given of the reſpective ſyſtems of Plato and Ariſtotle, it will be eaſy to perceive that the writings of the former were beſt adapted to the purpoſes of both Pythagoreans and Platonicians, they were equally induſtrious in impoſing on themſelves. A ſhort compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle, the reſult of a careful ſtudy of their ineſtimable works, will place the matter in a clear point of view. Plato's practical philoſophy nearly coincides with Ariſtotle's. Both of them are admirable teachers of a pure and ſublime morality; but their ſeveral modes of enforcing the ſame maxims are as different as the oppoſite bents of their genius. In Ariſtotle, demonſtration is the principal; and illuſtration, ſparingly uſed as a decent *accessory* or *appendage*. Plato, on the contrary, diſdains no ornament within his reach; delights, after exciting ſurpriſe, to gratify well-prepared expectation, and condeſcends on ſubjects peculiarly within the province of reaſon, to uſe the language of paſſion and fancy, to ſtrengthen argument by fable, and fortify belief by wonder; whereas his rival, with more commanding authority, ſubdues even the heart and affections through the reſiſtleſs conviction of the underſtanding. The form of compoſition, almoſt perpetually employed by Plato, is that of pure drama, a mode of writing excellently adapted to the diſplay of his verſatile genius and flowery fancy; of a mind ſtored with images that he could combine with taſte, and crowded with ideas that he could acutely diſcriminate. Yet, with all theſe advantages, his *enthusiasm* and love of the *marvellous*, his doctrine of *ideas*, and his *dæmon* world, his explanation of mythology by allegory, thus confounding the provinces of philoſophy and popular ſuperſtition; theſe ſhadowy prominences of Plato were calculated to allure and delight many who remained blind to his brighteſt merits, and thereby fitted the labours of this great genius rather to co-operate with, than counteract, the perverters of ſenſe and ſcience, who ſprang up with wild luxuriance among the Greeks and Romans, after thoſe nations had loſt, as it were, their love of truth, together with their paſſion for true glory, their manly ſpirit, and their liberty. Under the Romans, theſe corrupters of learning, as well as philoſophy, aſſumed the name of Eclectics, becauſe they ſelected

from

from all the different ſchools the tenets moſt agreeable to their fancy. But as Plato was their favourite idol, they were called alſo later Platoniſts or Platonicians; and having new-moulded to their own taſte the wildeſt doctrines of their maſter, they applied them in this corrupt ſtate to the interpretation of the philoſophy of Ariſtotle."

The author enumerates the moſt diſtinguiſhed names of this ſect; and it appears to have included ſome men of real ability and learning; and at their head Plutarch and Longinus After dwelling for a conſiderable length on the hiſtory of the Eclectics, he in a few words gives a view of their ſpecific tenets.

"Upon a careful analyſis of their writings, the whole of their pretended philoſophy will be found to reſolve itſelf into the great doctrines of theurgy and perfectibility; the former of which has loſt all credit within the two laſt centuries, and the latter has vainly ſtruggled for revival under the viſionaries of the preſent times. Taking for their foundation Plato's ideas, and his *dæmon world*, commented and amplified by the philoſophical legends through which Greek learning began ſhortly after the age of Alexander the Great, to be amalgamated with Aſiatic fables and Egyptian ſuperſtition, the later Platoniſts raiſed a ſtrange and motley edifice, bulky without greatneſs, and dazzling without real or ſteady ſplendour. The continual object indeed of the whole ſchool was to reconcile Ariſtotle with Plato. It may ſeem extraordinary that a ſucceſſion of men, deſerving either of ridicule or of pity, ſhould have been held in great eſtimation by their contemporaries for upwards of three centuries. But the Platonicians were coeval with the decrepitude of reaſon, as well as of manhood, ſince they began and flouriſhed amidſt the corruptions that enſued after the Roman world had been deformed by conflicting uſurpers, overwhelmed by deſolating barbarians, and remained in every province a prey to a brutal ſoldiery."

Such were the commentators upon Ariſtotle, whom Dr. Gillies rejects as guides to his meaning, which they were either incapable of comprehending, or, from the prepoſſeſſions of their ſect, deſirous of perverting. Theſe are the guides which Mr. Taylor has choſen, guides as proper for a viſionary ſciolift as they are unfit for a ſound philoſopher.

As the Supplement to Dr. Gillies's Analyſis, in demonſtrating Ariſtotle to have delivered ſenſe and reaſon, and to have delivered them intelligibly, without which they could be of no uſe, neceſſarily differed from Mr. Taylor, who would make the Stagirite the utterer of the myſtical jargon of Mr. Taylor's models the Platonicians, this modern Eclectic is ſeized with a violent rage, and in that rage betakes himſelf to philoſophical diſcuſſion. The reſult is a pamphlet which ſhall be the ſubject of the following article.

An Answer to Dr. Gillies's Supplement to his new Analysis of Aristotle's Works; in which the unfaithfulness of his Translation of Aristotle's Ethics is unfolded. By Thomas Taylor. Symonds. 1804. Pp. 92. 8vo.

THE motto which ushers in this answer serves as a sample of what the reader is to expect in the production.

Ηρακλειτος εγω· τι με ὦ κατω ελκετ' αμουσοι;
Ουχ' υμιν επονουν, τους δε μ' επισταμενους·
Εις εμοι ανθρωπος τρισμυριοι· οι δ' αναριθμοι
Ουδεις· ταυτ' αυδω και παρα Περσεφονη. DIOG. LAERT.

Begone, ye *blockheads!* Heraclitus cries,
And leave my labours to the *learn'd* and *wise*;
By *wit*, by *knowledge*, studious to be read,
I scorn the *multitude*, alive and dead. JOHNSON.

We remember an observation in the "Monthly Review," on some article which the author, in a preface, declared to be a very able and valuable performance. The Reviewer, it seems, thought otherwise; and after he had delivered his opinion, reverting to that which had been given by the author, the critic remarked that "a writer's judgment in favour of his own work can not be implicitly received as one of the canons of criticism," we are disposed to apply this remark to Mr. Taylor. We cannot admit him either to be learned or wise, merely because he himself tells us that he is learned and wise, nor every man to be a blockhead who may not allow to Mr. Taylor the same degree of erudition and wisdom, which he is pleased to allow to himself.

The first paragraph of the work continues the same style of arrogant assumption which the motto exhibits. "Dr. Gillies having thought proper to *attempt* a confutation of the proofs which *I* have brought forward to the public, of *his not having* given either the manner or the matter of Aristotle, in a work which *he calls* a translation of the ethics and politics of that philosopher, and as he has also presumed to ridicule the *most sublime* of Plato's doctrines, and to calumniate the best of his disciples, displaying in his attempt no less ignorance than illiberal invective, *it now becomes necessary that I should fully unfold to the public* the injustice which he has done to Aristotle, in that work, and also to the best of the Platonists, in the Supplement to the Analysis of Aristotle's Speculative works."

It would be difficult to find such a short passage so replete with egotism, and not merely the egotism of silly vanity, but of insolent arrogance. Who is this Mr. Thomas Taylor, who undertakes to be the general corrector of philosophical error, and the only man who understands Plato and Aristotle? We know nothing of his years, but from his dictatorial presumption we should suppose him a raw boy fresh from some dissenting academy, where he may have been the best

Greek

Greek ſcholar, and may have meaſured the extent of poſſible attainment by the very limited attainments of ſuch ſeminaries. He gives judgment with all the unheſitating confidence of juvenile inexperience and preſumptuous ignorance. He affirms that Dr. Gillies is unacquainted with the acroamatic writings of Ariſtotle, *becauſe* he does not find out that they are remarkably obſcure. Dr. Gillies bringing to the inveſtigation of Ariſtotle that clear and vigorous caſt of underſtanding which is founded in ſtrong common ſenſe, and poſſeſſing the learning and philoſophy which ſuch an underſtanding is peculiarly fitted to acquire, diſcovers in Ariſtotle every poſition, principle, ſeries of reaſoning, and moral leſſon which the works of ſuch a profound philoſopher contain, and which a preciſe, accurate, and perſpicuous writer can expreſs. What the powerful, informed, and cultivated intellect of Dr. Gillies comprehends his ability and ſkill render luminous to a reader. Mr. Taylor carrying to the conſideration of Ariſtotle a flimſy underſtanding, that is well fitted for being a receptacle of ſcioliſm, and a viſionary imagination that is become more eccentric from copying extravagant models, conceives himſelf to diſcover in the deepeſt and cleareſt of ſages great quantities of that mud which exiſts in his own brain.

There was once, in a certain Scottiſh preſbytery, an honeſt clergyman, who was a great reader, but unfortunately very deficient in the thinking faculty. One day this paſtor was employed in an exerciſe called lecturing; that is, either explaining the Scriptures, or trying to explain the Scriptures. The ſubject was a practical portion of one of St. Paul's Epiſtles, which is as clear as poſſible, for fully digeſted thoughts, expreſſed in the plaineſt and moſt ſignificant language. But the poor preacher could make no hand of it, and after going backwards and forwards, but without coming one whit nearer the point, he very gravely told the congregation, that the apoſtle purpoſely diſguiſed his own meaning. The fault was not in Paul, but in the perſon who undertook to interpret him, without having a line of underſtanding ſufficiently long for diving beyond the very ſurface. He made a myſtery of what was obviouſly intelligible, but that he could not underſtand. Mr. Taylor has a great propenſity to the creation of ſuch myſteries. Our author cites the ſame chapter of Ariſtotle that was quoted by Dr. Gillies, and affects to vilify the verſion. We have compared the original with the two tranſlations. The performance of Dr. Gillies does not adhere ſo cloſely to the Greek words as to give particle for particle, but he preſents the whole of the ſenſe in an unbroken ſeries. The tranſlation of Mr. Taylor, we really do not underſtand, and we muſt allow him the praiſe which he ſo ardently ſeeks, that he is unintelligible. In ſome parts, indeed, we can, through the cloudy darkneſs of his language, perceive ſome glimmering of meaning, but the ſenſe quickly eludes his graſp. He is like one playing at blindman's-buff, who is ſometimes near getting hold of an object of his purſuit, but again loſes it, and even runs his head againſt poſts and walls. Mr. Taylor repeats the extravagant and nonſenſical

jargon of Pythagorean numbers and Platonic ideas, as having a real ſubſtantial exiſtence in nature, and as being the true cauſes of the univerſe; and after pouring out his invectives againſt the Analyſis and Supplement of Dr. Gillies, he proceeds to beſpatter Gillies's tranſlation of the "Ethics and Politics." When he cenſures the interpreter of Ariſtotle violently, this viſionary ſcioliſt preſents to the reader the tranſlation which he would recommend; and in this manner we have before us both their verſions of various paſſages. One of the leading differences between the tranſlations of Taylor and Gillies is, that *Taylor literally gives word for word*, GILLIES SENSE FOR SENSE. Mr. Taylor's tranſlation regards every article, noun, pronoun, verb, and participle, adverb, conjunction, prepoſition, and would form a very good model for a boy tranſlating a Greek paſſage, to ſhew his grammatical knowledge of that tongue, but the verſion of Taylor does not ſhew the reader what the original philoſopher is doing. Gillies, without ſuch a ſuperſtitious adherence to the Grecian idiom (when his object is to write Engliſh), gives the ſenſe of the Grecian ſage in the pureſt Engliſh. Mr. Taylor is evidently a mere verbal ſcholar, and ſuch have their uſe. We doubt not he might paſs muſter as Greek uſher in an academy; but philoſophy appears to be beyond his reach. There is a common miſtake among writers, that what they ſuppoſe themſelves to be very fond of, therein they muſt excel. This is a very groſs miſapprehenſion. In moſt caſes mental as well as corporeal propenſity often exiſts without power. Mr. Taylor, we believe, may ſuppoſe himſelf born, as he declares he is, for reſtoring the purity of philoſophy, and may conſcientiouſly declare he believes the divinity favourable to his undertaking. We as conſcientiouſly declare our conviction, that if it was the intention of Providence that Mr. Taylor, as he himſelf ſays, "*was to preſerve to poſterity the elements of the virtues, and the rules of truth, as a paternal and immortal inheritance*," the divine wiſdom would have afforded to a perſon deſtined for ſuch important purpoſes, a much greater portion of human wiſdom. In fact we can ſee no marks of peculiar divine favour in a common and blundering underſtanding, that has been able to attain a dictionary making knowledge of an antient tongue, but has quite miſconceived the writings that he has met in that tongue.

Little as Mr. Taylor has ſhewn himſelf fitted for comprehending the ſages of Greece, yet we are far from deeming him unqualified for uſeful productions on ſubjects connected with the Greek. We ſhould ſuppoſe the talents and acquirements of Mr. Taylor might produce Greek grammatical exerciſes, on the model of Turner's Latin, or might make improvements on the Eaton grammar. We think the number of conjugations might be leſſened, and changes might be made in the declenſions of nouns. Boys might be the better for ſuch a direction of Mr. Taylor's powers and acquirements; but we are afraid men can never derive much benefit from the time he may be pleaſed to beſtow on Plato or Ariſtotle.

An Eſſay on the Principle of Commercial Exchanges, and more particularly of the Exchange between Great Britain and Ireland; with an Inquiry into the practical Effects of the Bank Reſtrictions. By John Leſlie Forſter, Eſq. of Lincoln's Inn. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 208. 5s. Hatchard. 1804.

THE author informs us in his Introduction, that he originally intended to have confined his work to a brief examination of the ſyſtem of commercial intercourſe, which for ſome time has ſubſiſted between Great Britain and Ireland; but in the proſecution of the inquiry, it appeared indiſpenſible, previouſly to eſtabliſh fixed and general principles. Theſe he has applied more particularly to the intercourſe between Great Britain and the Sifter Iſland. The work is divided into ſix chapters, of which the firſt three are devoted to the general theory of exchange, and the reſt to the examination and diſcuſſion of the ſtate of exchange between Britain and Ireland, with its cauſes and relations.

The firſt chapter conſiders the general nature and the effects of the balance of debt. There is a difference between the balance of trade and the balance of debt. The former means the exceſs of exports above imports; and while political economy was imperfectly underſtood, was regarded as the criterion of the wealth of nations. But more enlarged experience matured and methodized into ſcience, has demonſtrated that riches, either relative or abſolute, do not depend on the balance of trade, but on the amount of profit. The balance of debt is the exceſs of money to be paid beyond money to be received; or, in fact no more than what plain mercantile language denominates the balance of accounts. The balance of debt, our author maintains, can never be either favourable or unfavourable to any country. The trade of the bullion merchant for ever prevents the balance of debt from being permanently favourable to a country, by continually exporting in exchange for commodities the ſurplus quantity of the precious metals, which a temporary balance of debt had introduced. The balance of debt can never be permanently unfavourable to a country, becauſe it is impoſſible permanently to exhauſt it of the quantity of the precious metals neceſſary to its circulation. This poſition he illuſtrates by a detailed view of the reciprocal and relative demands for precious metals and other commodities.—His diſſertation on this ſubject, manifeſts him acquainted with Adam Smith, and with later writers, who have treated of money and paper credit. With little novelty it contains conſiderable accuracy. Our author conſiders the connection between foreign expenditure and the balance of trade; and examines the balance of trade in its relation to national wealth. The balance of debt does not determine the rate of exchange. The unfavourableneſs of the exchange is commenſurate with the expenſe of tranſmitting the precious metals from the debtor to the creditor country. This criterion he illuſtrates, by the

exchange

exchange between London and Dublin. Our author takes a view of the *medium* in which payments are made. The meaſure of value may be augmented, or depreciated. If the medium conſiſt of the precious metals, depreciation may proceed either from degradation or adulteration. If in paper, either in diſcredit or exceſs. The operation of theſe various cauſes he ſketches.

He proceeds to apply his principles to the exchange between Great Britain and Ireland; examines the rates between various towns of Ireland and London. He attempts to prove, that there is an exceſs of paper iſſued both by the National Bank of Ireland and of England. His aſſertion reſpecting the firſt, is not evinced by his proofs and arguments; and reſpecting the ſecond, it can be confuted by every man that has any experience in bank notes. Is not paper guaranteed by the nation as efficient a repreſentative of commodities, as any that can be uſed. Has not the Bank effects to anſwer all its engagements; and will not a certain piece of paper, including the name of Abraham Newland, and containing the two words one thouſand, purchaſe as much and as valuable commodities as nine hundred and fifty-two pieces of gold, and eight pieces of ſilver, having alſo a national guarantee. Both the paper and the gold are inſtruments for the circulation of commodities, and in Britain they are equivalent.—The reſt of the work continues the detail on Iriſh exchange; and contains ſeveral obſervations that deſerve the attention both of merchants and politicians. On the whole, however, we do not think his objections to the preſent ſyſtem of Bank Reſtriction, ſupported by adequate arguments. He enters very fully into the conſideration of Lord King's view of this ſubject.

"It was firſt (he ſays) propoſed by Lord King in the Houſe of Lords, that a clauſe ſhould be introduced into the Bank Reſtriction, obliging the Bank of Ireland to pay their paper in notes of the Bank of England. This meaſure, founded in the ſtricteſt juſtice, has been ſince fully adopted in principle by the Select Committee: in one reſpect, however, it appears that its conſequences would be materially different from thoſe which were originally expected from it. Inſtead of compelling the Iriſh Directors to diminiſh their iſſues, it might enable them eventually conſiderably to augment them; and it ſeems not to be the leaſt of its recommendations, that it would convey to the National Bank that controul which it ought to poſſeſs, but which it does not. The Bank of Ireland, at preſent, is one of the many competitors for the ſupply of the Iriſh market; and although their iſſues to the amount of three millions may, in their preſent ſituation, be more than fall to their ſhare; yet it does not follow, that, if their competitors were deſtroyed, three millions would then be too great a proportion. The Bank of Ireland is by many ſuppoſed to ſupply but one-half of the Dublin market: if thoſe bankers, who at preſent ſupply the reſt, were, like the bankers of London, to find it impoſſible to iſſue notes in competition with the National Bank, the Directors of the Bank of Ireland would find not only an opportunity, but a neceſſity, greatly to augment their iſſues, for the demands of Dublin alone."

To

To the work is subjoined an Appendix, containing the official value of imports and exports of Ireland; as well as their current value at recent periods; and also tables of the rates of exchange. Its various contents are in many respects useful, and in that view deserving of notice.

POETRY.

Good Tidings! or, News from the Farm. A Poem. By Robert Bloomfield, Author of the Farmer's Boy, &c.

WE have read the former productions of this poet with great pleasure, and took up his "Good Tidings" with expectations which have not, altogether, been fulfilled. Its comparative brevity, and the unprepossessing nature of its subject; its *table* octavo size, and thirty-seven pages, rather qualified the pleasure we had anticipated from its perusal.—Such a compliment was certainly due to the discoverer of the vaccine innoculation, and few, perhaps, could have paid it with more feeling or more effect. The ravages the disease of the small-pox has made in Mr. B.'s own family, made it a subject of peculiar interest to him; and he has rendered it so in a great degree to the reader. His picture of a "Blind Boy," who has been left by his play-fellows, is penned with peculiar felicity, and must awaken the most lively sympathy in the mind of every one who reads it. He is described to

> "Creep on the warm green turf for many an hour,
> And pluck by chance the white and yellow flow'r;
> Smoothing their stems while resting on his knees,
> He binds a nosegay which he never sees;
> Along the homeward path, then feels his way,
> *Lifting his brow against the shining day,*
> And, *with a playful rapture round his eyes,*
> Presents a sighing parent with the prize."

He describes his mother's anxiety during his illness, who

> "Hour after hour, when all was still beside,
> When the pale night-light in its socket died,
> Alone she sat."

The burial of these wretched victims by night, is enforced by that poetical association of ideas, which it is useless to censure, and idle to praise.

> "No bell was heard to toll, no funeral pray'r,
> No kindred bow'd, no wife, no children there;
> Its horrid nature could inspire a dread,
> That cut the bonds of custom like a thread.
> The humble church-tow'r higher seem'd to shew,
> Illumin'd by their trembling light below,
> The solemn night-breeze struck each shiv'ring cheek;
> Religious reverence forbade to speak:

The

The ſtarting ſexton his ſhort ſorrow ſhed,
When the earth murmur'd on the coffin lid,
And falling bones, and ſighs of holy dread,
Sounded a requiem to the ſilent dead."

But

" Let the ſerpent die! this glorious prize
Sets more than life and health before our eyes,
For beauty triumphs too! Beauty! ſweet name,
Should rouſe the mother's feelings into flame;
For where dwells ſhe, who, while the virtues *grow*,
With cold indiff'rence marks the aching *brow*?
Or, with a lifeleſs heart and recreant blood,
Sighs not for daughters fair as well as good?
The *wish* is nature, and *cannot decay*,
'Tis univerſal as the beams of day;
Nor leſs the wiſh of man."

We are reviewers, cold callous reviewers; and though we could make objections to a few ſlight deviations from ſtrict poetical propriety, we echo the author's ſentiments with an alacrity which belongs to this world.—Though we are perfectly ſatisfied with our female circle of friends, we have no objection

" For ſong to riſe with ampler pow'r to ſpeak,
The new-born influence of beauty's cheek,

Which

Shall catch new fires in ev'ry ſacred grove;
Freſh inſpiration from the lips of love,
And write for ever on the riſing mind—
DEAD IS ONE MORTAL FOE OF HUMAN KIND!"

In page 33, we obſerved a glaring inſtance of the miſtaken ſpondee,

" We ſunk within a *boat's length* of the ſhore."

which is rank obſtinate proſe.

†

Gayton Wake; *or, Mary Dodd, and her List of Merits. A Poem in four Parts.* By Robert Llwyd, Author of Beaumaris Bay. Williams, Strand. 1804.

AS Mr. Llwyd does not profeſs to be a man of education, we are not inclined to be ſevere on this little publication. Though there is not much melody in the verſe, or much point in the attempts at humour in the poem itſelf, juſtice obliges us to ſay, that the author has uſed his ſtanzas as pegs to hang a number of very humorous and entertaining notes, which are full of anecdote and local information.

POLITICS.

POLITICS.

A Brief Inquiry into the preſent Condition of the Navy of Great Britain, and its Reſources: followed by ſome Suggeſtions calculated to remedy the Evils, the Exiſtence of which is made apparent in the courſe of the Inveſtigation, 8vo. Pp. 56. 1s. Highley. 1804.

THIS tract is underſtood to be the production of a diſtinguiſhed officer in the naval ſervice. Of its author's integrity and profeſſional ſkill, we have not the ſlighteſt doubt, but, though his motives may be pure, we fear that he is himſelf too much a party in the cauſe to be wholly free from prejudice. His "*Inquiry*" muſt be conſidered as an *attack* on the late Board of Admiralty; but, as an attack, it is feeble; his charges are not ably ſubſtantiated.

Our author's inquiry is thus prefaced: "In committing to the preſs the following obſervations on the preſent condit on of the Britiſh Navy, the writer profeſſes to have been influenced by a ſingle motive, that of exciting the preſent Board of Admiralty to thoſe exertions which alone can arouſe our Marine from the torpid and enfeebled ſtate into which it has fallen; and to that conciliatory, and prudent line of conduct which, while it may contribute to reſtore to it its priſtine vigour, may be productive of zeal, unanimity, and a ſpirit of enterprize, in each of its dependent branches. It has been impoſſible for him to accompliſh the aim he has had in view, without the production of many facts, which it has been painful to him to adduce; but, under circumſtances of ſo preſſing, and, indeed, of ſo alarming a nature, every other conſideration has yielded to that of the public benefit. Whatever eſteem he may privately entertain for thoſe whoſe miſtaken policy and erroneous meaſures, in their adminiſtrative capacity, have called forth all the ſeverity of his animadverſions, he could not have abſtained from them without ſubjecting himſelf to the imputation of a criminal concealment."

Relying on the efficiency of our military force, it has been conſidered by many of our countrymen, that the blockading ſyſtem, which has been ſo ſtrictly followed up during the late and preſent wars, is rather prejudicial than ſerviceable; and that, were we to grant the enemy a free paſſage over, we might meet him hand to hand, and overwhelm him on our own ſhores, without harraſſing our officers and ſeamen, or incurring the wear and tear of our ſhipping. That ſuch an opinion, however erroneous, ſhould be entertained by many of our military characters, does not much ſurpriſe us; but, that a naval officer ſhould recommend a ceſſation of blockade, is ſomewhat ſtrange. As, however, every profeſſion ought to be the moſt competent to decide on its own capabilities, we ſhall permit our author to ſpeak for himſelf on this ſubject. "How far the blockade," ſays he, "which has been attempted, was to be juſtified on motives of ſtate policy, on the breaking out of hoſtilities, is a queſtion which does not apply to the immediate circumſtances of war, when the enthuſiaſtic ardour diſplayed by all ranks of Britiſh ſubjects, has given ſuch a tone of vigour to our military preparations, that we feel the fulleſt confidence in the defenſive means we ſhould be enabled to aſſemble, if the enemy ſhould effect a landing, at any point, of the formidable forces collected

collected for attack. Were it indeed poſſible to keep ſo ſtrict a watch on the hoſtile ſhores, that every effort of the enemy to eſcape from his ports would be unavailing; that the fortuitous circumſtances of calms, fogs, gales, the obſcurity of the night, &c. would not in any degree advance his purpoſes; then would the eventual miſchief inſeparable from a blockade, by which our marine is threatened, find a compenſation in our immediate ſecurity. But, until this can be effected with a certainty of ſucceſs, the national intereſts ought not to be compromiſed, and our future offenſive and defenſive means unneceſſarily abridged.

"The blockade of Breſt, the expediency of which, in the firſt inſtance, is not to be controverted, has been followed up, with a perſiſtance which would have been creditable to a more diſcreet cauſe. It has already coſt us one ſhip of the line, the Magnificent; but this is a trivial loſs compared with that by which we are threatened. If this rigorous ſyſtem ſhould be ſtill purſued, there is little doubt but that ſome of the ſhips, now in a moſt deplorable condition, both with reſpect to their hulls and ſtores, muſt be expoſed to extreme riſk. In the interim, what is the ſtate of the crews? Harraſſed by continual watching and fatigues, the number of the ſick have been augmented to a very alarming degree, inſomuch that it has been found neceſſary to diſpatch Dr. Baird, the naval inſpector of hoſpitals, to apply the beſt remedy in his power to this very ſerious and growing calamity. In the North Sea, one of our frigates, the Creſcent, lately had thirty-ſix of her crew ill of the ſea-ſcurvy. An inſtance of this nature did not occur during the entire progreſs of the late war. If the crews of the ſhips employed in the blockade labours under theſe phyſical derangements, the ſufferings and privations to which they are expoſed, by night and by day, muſt have an equally baneful effect on the feelings both of the officers and men. From the irritation of the latter, whoſe anxiety and impatience muſt be wrought to the higheſt pitch, we have, at leaſt, to apprehend, that they may eventually become diſguſted with a ſervice which has been to them both painful and unprofitable. Without dwelling, however, on the probably future conſequences, of the meaſures which have been purſued, it may not be amiſs to obſerve, that at the preſent time, we can as ill afford to loſe our ſeamen as our ſhips; and it is painful to reflect, for a moment even on the loſſes with which we are threatened, by the growth and progreſs of diſeaſe in our blockading ſquadrons. Taking into this account the deſtruction of the ſhips which, however ſolid their materials may be, cannot withſtand much longer a ſervice of ſuch a nature, the proſpect before us would be truly alarming, if we had not reaſon to

---

* It is not ſurpriſing that ſo many difficulties occurred, at the breaking out of hoſtilities, in manning our fleet. The ſpirit of emigration among the Britiſh ſeamen, and the encouragements proffered to them by their politic enemy, were ſuch that more than ten thouſand are ſaid to have emigrated from the port of London alone. The progreſs of this alarming defection of our ſeamen was well known at the time, but we cannot find that any attempt was made to apply a remedy. The economical ſyſtem (for the *prudence* and *policy* of which we refer to the extract of Earl *St. Vincent's* ſpeech in 1783) to be acted on, forbade the adoption of any meaſures which could have a tendency to keep them at home, and to enſure their future ſervices.

repoſe

repoſe every confidence in thoſe who have been choſen to extricate us from our difficulties. The taſk will be then to aſcertain how far, and in what practicable mode, the blockade can be ſtill purſued, without a manifeſt detriment to ourſelves, and a riſk of our moſt valuable intereſts. The better protection of our own ſhores, by expedients effectually adapted to fruſtrate the views of the enemy, will, without doubt, be one of the earlieſt objects of their enquiry."

This pamphlet might, without much impropriety, have been termed, *A Vindication of the private Ship Builders.* By profeſſional men, we believe, it is pretty generally conſidered, that the ſervice has too long been a prey to the avarice of theſe contracting gentry. They are, however, confident in the integrity of their own cauſe; and we learn, from our author, that, "To remove every unfavourable impreſſion which may have been made on the public mind by the illiberal aſperſions caſt on them in the late proceedings in parliament, three of the principal builders in the river, Meſſrs. WELLS, BARNARD, and BRENT, who have, for many years, made the moſt commendable exertions for the advancement of the public ſervice, declare their readineſs to come forward, and to challenge a competition between the laſt three ſhips of the line built by them, for the ſervice of his Majeſty's government, and the three laſt built at the King's yards. If the former ſhould not, in the opinion of profeſſional men, and competent judges, be found to have been conſtructed with as good materials, and with as good workmanſhip, as the latter; theſe builders will not heſitate to make the country a preſent of *a line of battle ſhip.* They repel every idea of a preference being given to King's built ſhips, over thoſe which have been built by them under the ſpecific contracts. The ſhips they have named for the compariſon are the Hero, the Repulſe, and the Illuſtrious."

The following ſtatement, though it may not be wholly free from prejudice, ſufficiently proves, that notwithſtanding the late pretenſions to reform, in his Majeſty's dock yards, the Augean ſtable has not yet been *fully* cleanſed

"In the ſix dock yards of Portſmouth, Plymouth, Chatham, Deptford, Woolwich, and Sheerneſs, thirteen ſhips of the line are either building, or have been *ordered* to be built. Of theſe, three are firſt rates; four, ſecond rates; and ſix, third rates, or ſhips to carry ſeventy-four guns. It is ſome conſolation to know that one of the firſt rates, the Hibernia, building at Plymouth, is planked up, and may be launched this year. But our future proſpects are not quite ſo cheering. The Ocean, of ninety-eight guns, a ſecond rate, has been in progreſs, in Woolwich Yard, upwards of twelve years, and is, notwithſtanding, ſtill in her frame. The Boyne, likewiſe, a ſecond rate, is building at Portſmouth, at which place the Scipio, of ſeventy-four guns has been in progreſs more than ſix years, and obſerves pretty nearly the ſame ratio of *diſpatch* as the Ocean, a part only of her frame being cut out. The Invincible, of the ſame rate, building at Woolwich, has been in progreſs upwards of two years, but her keel is not yet laid. A firſt rate, the Queen Charlotte, has been three years in progreſs at Deptford; and the moſt that can be ſaid reſpecting her is, that a few of her timbers have been cut out. The Fame, of 74 guns, building in the ſame yard, has a part of her frame up. At Chatham, the Impregnable, a ſecond rate, is in her frame; the Revenge, of 74 guns, has a part of her frame up; and the Warſpite, of the ſame force, is in progreſs. The Caledonian,

ledonian, a firſt rate, to be built at Plymouth, has been ordered ſeveral years, but her keel is not yet laid. The Union, of 98 guns, is under the ſame circumſtances, in that yard; as is likewiſe the Bombay, a third rate, at Deptford. Four frigates, which are now conſtructing, and are in a greater or leſs ſtate of forwardneſs, make up the ſum total of the operations, as they refer to new ſhips in the King's yards.

"We may, however, according to the very logical reaſoning of our late naval adminiſtration, ſafely place our dependence on them, for the furtherance of all our plans of maritime equipment. But to have carried into effect the very deſirable purpoſe of rendering them what they have been inconſiderately deſcribed, if it even be granted that the ſhips with which they are provided are ſuffi iently numerous for every purpoſe of conſtruction; and that an adequate ſpace could have been found for the reception of the immenſe maſs of ſtores of every deſcription which muſt have been collected, it was neceſſary, in the firſt place, not only that the old eſtabliſhment of artificers, labourers, &c. ſhould have been kept up in its full and entire ſtate, but likewiſe that a great majority of thoſe employed in the private yards, ſhould have been called in to their aid. Secondly, it was neceſſary that large purchaſes of timber, and other building materials ſhould have been made at a time when they were eaſily procurable.

"To fulfil the former of theſe conditions, that of keeping up the full complement of artificers, &c. in the King's yards, what was the conduct of the late Admiralty, during the ſhort interval of peace, which carried with it the certain prognoſtic of a warfare ſtill more terrible than ever? It will naturally be ſuppoſed, that the motive of the viſits which were paid to the different ports, was to hold out a cheering proſpect of encouragement, to redreſs grievances where they were known to exiſt, and to conciliate every claſs and rank of the individuals employed in the Royal Arſenal, from the maſter builder, whoſe merit had raiſed him to the ſummit of his profeſſion, down to the youth who had juſt thrown himſelf into the career of advancement. Not at all:—the abuſes which were to be corrected, had made ſo powerful an impreſſion on the imagination of our naval reformers, as to have obliterated every other conſideration which prudence and policy might have ſuggeſted. The reaſonings about parſimony, to which the noble earl, then at the head of the admiralty, alluded in his ſpeech of 1783, were no longer "idle and unſubſtantial," but were to be acted on to the utmoſt extent of which they were ſuſceptible. To the end that the tree might flouriſh with greater vigour, all the branches that were deemed uſeleſs were to be lopped off. Men were to be conſidered, in this inſtance, as ſo many animals, and in the ſame way as it is not deemed to be any recommendation by the coachmaſter, that the ſorry hack he has under his charge has once been a high mettled racer; inſomuch, that when he is no longer able to work, his carcaſe is given, without reluctance, to the dogs; ſo it was that the reform in the dock yard was to be entered on by the diſcharge of the aged, the infirm, and the bed-ridden. The name which had ſtood the longeſt on the books of the clerk of the cheque, was, accordingly, the firſt to paſs the muſter; and this gave the young men time to make *their* reflections. What was the reſult of them? That as they could not flatter themſelves with the proſpect of a certain proviſion, when their ſervices likewiſe ſhould be paſt, the moſt prudent ſtep they could take would be, to turn theſe ſervices, in the interim, to the beſt account they could. Thus between thoſe who were diſcharged by the government, on the ſaving

plan,

plan, and thoſe who diſcharged themſelves, on the prudential plan *, a chaſm has been left in our Royal Arſenals, which it will not be able to fill up; and in deſpite of which it has been contended, that a part is now able to do more than the whole could formerly effect. This may be highly figurative, but it muſt be made to yield to facts.

"In one of the ſmaller of our dock yards, that of Woolwich, there is, at this time, a deficiency of 125 ſhipwrights, and 90 labourers. It has been found neceſſary to hire a certain number of the ſoldiers doing duty in the vicinity, to perform, as far as they may be competent to that purpoſe, the taſks aſſigned to the latter; but the ſervices of the former, who may be conſidered, in their particular line, as artiſts of a very valuable deſcription, cannot be ſo eaſily replaced. If they are equally ſhort of complement in the other dock yards, it is demonſtrable that there cannot be a ſufficient number of hands to meet the exigencies of the common repairs which the war has rendered indiſpenſibly requiſite. At Deptford, likewiſe, the labourers fall conſiderably ſhort in their numbers; they are, in their relative operations, as neceſſary as the ſhipwrights themſelves; and when the proportion of them is reduced to a certain extent, the labours to be performed muſt be commenſurately impeded."

The ſcarcity of timber is the next ſubject to which our author directs his attention.

"But a ſhort interval," ſays he, "has elapſed, ſince the Navy Board made a communication to the late Admiralty to ſtate, that as it had been repreſented to have been the fault of that Board, that the timber in the dock yards had been, as it then actually was, reduced to *the expenditure of a few months only*, it became neceſſary for them, the members of the Navy Board, publicly to refute the charge, and to prove that the whole of the difficulty, and the conſequences which might reſult from it, aroſe from the conduct of their lordſhips reſpecting the receipt of timber, and the treatment which thoſe who had contracted with them had received on its delivery.

"*That, therefore, in juſtice to themſelves, they had to requeſt, that a committee of the Houſe of Commons ſhould be appointed, to inquire into their conduct on this occaſion.*

"That Sir WILLIAM RULE had returned without the ſmalleſt ſucceſs, the timber dealers having entered into an engagement not to ſupply the Board; and that, for what might have been purchaſed twelve months ſince, at the price of four pounds five ſhillings and ſixpence, ten pounds, and even more, were now demanded."

Farther on, he obſerves,

"It would ſcarcely be believed, if the artificers and other perſons belonging to the dock yards at Portſmouth, were not ready to atteſt the fact, that on the 4th of the preſent month (May), not a ſingle four inch plank was to be found in that yard. In proportion as ſcanty ſupplies of timber were obtained, it was inſtantly applied to the ſhips; and on the

* Some time after the reform above alluded to, a letter was received and publicly handed about, from a Britiſh artificer, then engaged, together with more than an hundred others, at Bourdeaux, to his friend in Woolwich yard. This letter was filled with expreſſions of the ſatisfaction of himſelf, and of his countrymen, and colleagues, at the reception they had met on the other ſide, and the encouragements they had received.

arrival of a load, there was ſo much ſcrambling for it, more eſpecially for the crooked timber, that diſturbances were nearly excited among the workmen. In the caſe of a part of the crooked timber, the leaves were ſtill green."

We ſhall conclude the preſent article with our author's propoſed remedy for the ſcarcity of timber, which is unqueſtionably a ſerious evil.

"It being taken for granted, that the growth is inadequate to the conſumption, which has been increaſed of late years by the augmented claims of our commerce, for which a proportional amount of freightage was to be provided, as well as by the efforts made to preſerve our dominion by ſea, our attention muſt neceſſarily be directed to every part of the globe, where there is a poſſibility of procuring timber, or naval ſtores of any deſcription, which may be indiſpenſible, and which we cannot obtain among ourſelves. For the furtherance of this purpoſe, India preſents itſelf as an inexhauſtible ſource, whence we may derive our needful ſupplies. To provide them in abundance, and as early as may be practicable, will be our "beſt and happieſt economy." In the interim, it would, perhaps, be expedient that private builders ſhould be prevented, by an act of the legiſlature, from conſtructing ſhips exceeding five hundred tons for the ſervice of the merchants in general, and eight hundred tons for the Eaſt India Company. It would be politic, at the ſame time, in the government, to beſtow bounties on thoſe who ſhould employ iron knees throughout, in ſhips of from five hundred to eight hundred tons. The laudable example of the Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures, and Commerce, by which encouragements are holden out to thoſe who form large plantations of oaks and other trees, may be efficaciouſly followed by our legiſlators, who ſhould offer ſimilar bounties for every produce which may enter into the plan for the conſtruction of ſhips."

A Reply to a Pamphlet intitled "A Brief Enquiry into the Preſent Condition of the Navy of Great Britain:" wherein is clearly demonſtrated the Force of the Enemy, and what was oppoſed to it by the late Board of Admiralty; as well as the actual Strength poſſeſſed by the King's Dock Yards, and their Ability to keep up and increaſe the Navy, without the Aid of Merchant Builders. 8vo. Pp. 36. 1s. Ginger. 1804.

IN peruſing this "*Reply*," we have been much intereſted. The author of the pamphlet which forms the ſubject of the preceding article, we are fully ſatisfied, wrote from principle; and, though he may not have eſtabliſhed the truth of all that he has aſſerted, we fully acquit him of all intentional blame. The motives of the preſent writer we believe to be equally pure. It will be acknowledged, by every impartial reader, that he is completely maſter of his ſubject; and that in argument, information, and fact, he has greatly the advantage of the *Inquirer*. He is an advocate for the late Board of Admiralty, and conſequently defends the ſyſtem of blockade; he is not friendly to the contractors, yet he does not attempt to conceal the important facts which militate againſt the management of the King's dock yards, &c.

In repelling the inſinuations which had been thrown out, relative to a want of energy in our naval department, he preſents the following gratifying ſtatement, which ought to inſpire a due portion of confidence in our national ſtrength.

"One thouſand one hundred and five men above the *vote of the Houſe of Commons*

Commons for the year, were raiſed previous to their retiring from office, independent of an efficient body of ſea-fencibles, amounting to 31,945 men.

"The *moſt exaggerated* accounts which have been received of the enemy's preparations, ſtate them to conſiſt of 48 ſail of the line, 37 frigates, 22 corvettes, four praams (or ſloops of war) 120 gun-brigs of the firſt claſs, carrying each ſix guns, and 2115 gun-boats, ſchuyts, and boats and veſſels of every ſort or deſcription; to oppoſe which there were, on the day the late Admiralty retired, 88 ſail of the line, 15 fifties, 125 frigates, 92 ſloops, 18 bombs, 40 gun-brigs of 12 guns each, ſix gun-boats, 82 cutters and ſchooners, 41 armed ſhips, and 997 boats armed with guns, on the coaſt, beſides five ſail of the line, one fifty, four frigates, and three ſloops, which will be ready to commiſſion in the month of June. This ſtatement includes as well the enemy's as our own force in every part of the world; but as the general attention of the country has been directed to the threatened invaſion, I ſhall ſtate the force which the enemy *is ſaid to have prepared* for that purpoſe, and alſo that which the late Board of Admiralty *had allotted* to oppoſe it. From the Texel to Havre-de-Grace the enemy's preparations are ſaid to conſiſt of five ſail of the line, ſix frigates, ſix corvettes, four praams, 120 gun-brigs of ſix guns, and 2115 gun-boats, ſchuyts, and other boats and veſſels; to oppoſe which there were, under the command of Lord Keith and Sir James Saumarez, 21 ſail of the line, ſeven fifties, 36 frigates, 30 ſloops, 12 bombs, 29 gun-brigs of 12 guns each, 41 cutters and ſchooners, and 19 armed ſhips, independent of 925 boats and craft armed with guns, on the coaſt, in the Channel, and in the River Thames and Medway."

"In ſtating the number of men," ſays he, "I have followed the ſame plan as was adopted for making out the return to the Houſe of Commons, becauſe it is the only one from which a fair repreſentation can be made: the *data* on which it is grounded being the number of men muſtered at the lateſt period to which correct returns have been received at the Navy Office, and the number of men raiſed ſince that day at the ſeveral rendezvous."

This pamphlet contains much important information relative to the Royal Dock Yards, and may be conſidered as furniſhing abundant proof, that much, *very much*, yet remains to be done in the *reforming* way. It appears that, in a King's yard, each gang is compoſed of the *very beſt*, the *middling*, and the *worſt* workmen that it contains, who all work together and receive wages alike; conſequently, there is no ſtimulus for exertion, and the *beſt* men are brought down to the level of the worſt. We really were not aware, that any of our national eſtabliſhments were conducted on principles ſo congenial with thoſe of PAINE's *Rights of Man*.

The *actual ſtrength*, however, of the king's dock yards, which our author conſiders to be far greater than has been ſuppoſed, is highly conſoling; and, with much ſatisfaction, we join with him in claiming the attention of adminiſtration to the following ſtatement:—

"I am able to aſſert, from the moſt accurate information, that the number of ſhipwrights and caulkers, excluſive of apprentices, employed in all the merchants' yards in England and Scotland, does not exceed 5329; and by the return laid before the Houſe of Commons reſpecting the trade and navigation of the country for the year 1803, it appears that in the preceding year 967 ſhips, of 104,789 tons had been built in the merchants'

yards (exclusive of two ships of the line, of 3436 tons for the navy;) and that 15,750 ships of 1,801,458 tons, had been kept in repair. Of these shipwrights and caulkers no more than 1116 are employed in the River Thames, who, besides the almost exclusive trade of the India Company, amounting to 89,076 tons, and the building and keeping in repair a full proportion of the above tonnage of merchant-ships, are, it is contended, capable of launching five or six sail of the line per year for the navy.

"By the return now before the House, it appears there are 3732 shipwrights and caulkers at this time employed in the king's yards, of whom 862 are apprentices, which leaves 2870 efficient shipwrights and caulkers, admitted, generally speaking, by all parties, to be far better workmen than those in the merchants' yards.

"The *whole navy*, that is, every ship or vessel (exclusive of such as have been recently purchased) appertaining to the crown, *including* hulks, prison-ships, &c. consists of 160 sail of the line, 22 fifties, 218 frigates, and 430 sloops and smaller vessels, making in all 830 ships and vessels, of about 523,331 tons, of which about 114,000 tons have been *taken from the enemy*, and, I blush to say, about 246,000 tons *have been built by contract*; leaving to the eternal disgrace of the king's yards, as their produce, notwithstanding they contain more than half the number of efficient shipwrights to be found in all the merchants' yards of this kingdom, *no more than about* 163,331 tons! And will it be credited, that the shipwrights in the king's yards were actually paid, during seven years of the late war, no less a sum than 1,962,636l. 18s. 9d. which is 80,775l. 6s. 3d. *more than the whole amount of building, and making the masts and yards of the whole navy* (as above stated) *even* INCLUDING ALL THE SHIPS TAKEN FROM THE ENEMY, AND BUILT BY CONTRACT!! Let it not, however, be supposed, that the new ships built in the king's yards are the only fruit which the country has received for the immense sums of money paid to the shipwrights therein: the case is very different, for much of their labour, *fettered* and *crippled as it is* by the mode of working them, which I have before pointed out, has been applied to the repairs of ships, and I may add, mostly *to those built by contract*. Of TWENTY-SIX sail of the line, which were in the action of the 1st of June, 1794, TEN had been built by contract, and cost 324,318l. on which had been expended in repairs (previous to the action) in the king's yards, no less than 171,124l. The repairs of the contract-built ships which were in the actions of the 14th of February, 1797, and 1st of August, 1798, bore a still greater proportion to their original costs, and the EIGHT contract-built ships, which were in the action of the 11th October, 1797, (exclusive of the four India-ships which had never before been at sea) cost 231,258l. and their repairs in the king's yards amounted to 172,400l.

"From the foregoing statement, it appears that 5329 shipwrights and caulkers (exclusive of apprentices) in the *merchants' yards*, can not only keep in repair nearly TWO MILLIONS OF TONS of shipping (which are in *constant wear*, and not lying in the harbours, as one third of the royal navy has, and ever will) and build upwards of 100,000 tons per year, but also add one half to the list of the navy, whilst 2870 shipwrights and caulkers in the king's yards have not kept in repair *five hundred and twenty-three thousand two hundred and thirty one* tons, and have built only 29 sail of the line in 24 years. Moreover, let it be remembered, as *a well authenticated fact*, that 46 shipwrights can, without any extraordinary exertion, *build a 74 gun-ship*

in

in twelve months! to which need only be added what has been ſtated by Mr. Wells, "that in the year 1795 he launched from *his yard* 8000 tons of ſhipping *more than* any three of his majeſty's yards together launched in the ſame period." I find that Mr. Wells has, at this time, in his yard, 140 ſhipwrights (apprentices included) which is 17 more than can be found in the employ of any other merchant-builder in the kingdom. What concluſion then, let me aſk, muſt be drawn with reſpect to the mode of working of the men in the king's yards, and *what they ought to perform*, when it is known, that three of the king's yards averaged, during the whole of the year 1795, TWO THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED and THIRTY ſhipwrights, apprentices included."

In contradiction to the author of the "*Inquiry*," but, we believe, in accordance with the opinion of moſt profeſſional men, the writer of the tract before us will not admit, that contract-built ſhips are ſo well put together as thoſe which are built in the king's yards; and, as to which ſhould have the preference, from economical views, we conceive that there cannot be much doubt, after peruſing the following ſtatement:

"It was far from my wiſh to have ſaid any thing reſpecting the meaſures which the preſent Firſt Lord of the Admiralty may think proper or be adviſed to purſue, with regard to the Navy; nor ſhould I have touched on the ſubject, had not the Brief Enquirer made an obſervation, "that the beſt mode of giving new vigour and energy to our marine, conſiſts in the employment of the merchant-docks for the repair of the ſhips in ordinary, &c." If any man ſhall have given this advice to the preſent Firſt Lord of the Admiralty, the following ſtatement will ſhew how unworthy he is, *be he who he may*, of his Lordſhip's confidence. I have purpoſely ſelected the circumſtances attending the Boſton, becauſe ſhe was repaired by Mr. Wells, who concludes his letter by ſaying, 'that not *one ſixpence* of his fortune has hitherto been derived from government; but that in his future contracts he means to ſecure to himſelf what he ſhall conſider as a juſt profit.'

"The Boſton, a 32 gun frigate, of 676 tons, was built by contract in the River Thames, in the year 1762, for 7534l, between which time and 1781, a period of 19 *years*, there was expended on her in repairs in the king's yards the ſum of 9522l. In 1783 ſhe was repaired by *contract* in Mr. Perry's yard, for FOURTEEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND THIRTY-FOUR POUNDS; and in the ſame year the Greyhound, a 32 gun frigate, of 682 tons, was built by another contractor, for 9872l. and had not one ſhilling laid out upon her in repair before 1794, a period of 11 *years*, whilſt the Boſton in 1791, after a lapſe of *only* eight *years* from the repair by contract, which had coſt *ſuch an enormous ſum*, was again repaired by Mr. Wells at the expence of *fourteen thouſand four hundred and fifty-three pounds*, at which time a *new ſhip of her ſize and claſs* (at the contract price then paid, viz. 12l. 4s per ton) would have coſt no more than 8247l.!!!

Various other points are diſcuſſed in this tract: in moſt inſtances, the reaſoning of the author is ſound, his inferences fair, and his concluſions juſt. It is altogether the moſt intereſting, and the moſt important publication that we have ſeen, relative to the preſent ſtate of the Britiſh navy.

An Anſwer to Mr. Pitt's Attack upon Earl St. Vincent and the Admiralty, in his Motion for an Enquiry into the State of the Naval Defence of the Country, on the 15th of March, 1804. 8vo. Pp. 58. 1s. 6d. Ebers. 1804.

Audi alteram Partem; or, the Real Situation of the Navy of Great Britain at the Period of Lord St. Vincent's Reſignation; being a Reply to the Miſtatements of "An Anſwer to Mr. Pitt's Attack upon Earl St. Vincent and the Admiralty;" alſo containing the Subſtance of a ſuppreſſed Pamphlet on the ſame Subject. By an Officer of his Majeſty's Navy. 8vo. Pp. 68. Budd. 1804.

ADHUC ſub judice lis eſt. This pamphlet having been ſubjected to the cognizance of another tribunal, we critics ſhall not preſume to pronounce judgment upon it. And as the two pamphlets are ſo materially connected, it would not be fair to criticiſe the one without the other. One word, however, on the *Criminal Information* lately moved for againſt the author of *Audi alteram Partem.* Mr. Erſkine, the counſel for Lord St. Vincent, laboured to prove that it muſt have been written by the ſame author who compoſed another pamphlet which was ſuppreſſed, and all the copies of which were ſent to the Admiralty. But, without entering into the merits of his argument, we ſhall ſimply ſtate, that we happen to know that he is egregiouſly miſtaken; for that the author of the ſuppreſſed pamphlet had no concern whatever with the pamphlet before us, and does not, to this moment, know by whom it was written. So much for *preſumptive*, or rather *argumentative*, proofs. But let not Mr. Erſkine *deduce* from this accidental knowledge of ours, that we wrote the ſuppreſſed pamphlet ourſelves, for his deduction would again be erroneous, for, ſtrange as it may appear to him, we have never even read it.

DIVINITY.

God and our Country. A Sermon, preached at the Parish Church of Giggleswick, in Craven, August 14; *alſo at Trinity Church, Leeds, August* 21, 1803. By Rowland Ingram, B. D. Publiſhed by requeſt. 8vo. Pp. 16. 4d. or 3s. a dozen. Binns, Leeds; Hatchard, London.

A SENSIBLE diſcourſe, from the 1ſt verſe of the 97th Pſalm, calculated to inſpire a juſt confidence in God, and to teach man to regulate his actions by juſt principles. In a political point of view, too, it is highly judicious and praiſeworthy.

A Diſcourſe occaſioned by the Death of the late Walter Taylor, Eſq. of Portſwood; preached at South Shoreham Church, on the 8th of May, 1803. By Daniel Lancaſter, A. B. Curate of South Shoreham. 8vo. Pp. 40. 1s. 6d. Robins, Wincheſter; Cadell and Davies, London; Ware, Whitehaven.

OF all ſermons, perhaps funeral ſermons are the moſt difficult to compoſe; as the compoſition of them requires, not only great knowledge, but an extraordinary degree of judgment in the application of it. In the diſcourſe before us, theſe indiſpenſible requiſites are not to be found; the preacher,

preacher, indeed, makes ſome very appropriate obſervations upon death, but when he comes to the immediate ſubject of his diſcourſe, he aſſumes a colloquial ſtyle, very ill-ſuited to the pulpit, and enters into ſuch details as, we apprehend, were never before introduced into a ſermon. When we read the following paſſage, and ſome others of the ſame kind, we were almoſt perſuaded that we had made a miſtake, and had taken up a newſpaper inſtead of a ſermon.

"As Mr. Taylor has lived among you all his life, the circumſtances of it are well known, and it would be unneceſſary to dwell on them. He is known to the world chiefly as a man of genius in mechanics, and the inventor of the curious machinery at Wood-Mill. His father and himſelf brought theſe machines, I underſtand, from nothing (ſhewing the futility of the old adage 'Ex nihilo nihil fit') to the ſtate in which they are now found; and the hiſtory of them is remarkable *. The Britiſh navy is ſupplied with pullies, made by means of this machinery, with ſo much accuracy, that the friction is conſiderably reduced, and the purchaſe, conſequently, increaſed, ſo that they muſt have been the means of ſaving many lives. Ships can be moved with much leſs force, and more expedition by them than the old ones; a circumſtance of great importance in the day of battle, eſpecially where the force on both ſides is nearly equal; and of the like importance in ſituations of hazard, where there is danger of ſhipwrecks. Mr. Taylor's father, in a voyage up the Mediterranean ſea, was in frequent danger of being caſt away, owing to the ſailors not being able to get the ſails up and down in an expeditious manner, from the erroneous principles on which the machines for executing it were conſtructed, and which led to the preſent invention of cutting them with a circular ſaw, by means of a ſlide.

"When I read what it was that firſt ſuggeſted the idea of the ſlide, of which Mr. Taylor has made ſo famous a uſe, and which has been ſo beneficial to his country; it put me in mind of Sir Iſaac Newton, who is ſaid to have taken the firſt ſuggeſtion of his great principle of gravitation from the falling of an apple from a tree to the ground. Mere trifles ſometimes lead to the moſt important diſcoveries."

We might extend our animadverſions on this diſcourſe, without tranſgreſſing the bounds of candour, or the laws of criticiſm, but it is an unpleaſant talk to dwell on defects where goodneſs of intention is manifeſt. We ſhall only add, therefore, that the object of our preacher's panegyric appears to have been "an excellent perſon;" and, though a diſſenter, "was very deſirous that I (Mr. Lancaſter, the curate), ſhould have ſome preferment."

The Right and Duty of defenſive War; a Sermon preached before a Society of Unitarian Diſſenters at Sheffield, on the 19th of October, 1803, being a Day recommended by Government for a National Faſt. To which is added an Appendix,

---

* "See the ſecond volume of the Hampſhire Repoſitory, which contains an account of his pumps and blocks, accompanied with plates, the accuracy of which may be depended on, as I know it was communicated by Mr. Taylor; he often mentioned to me in converſation the principal facts contained in that narrative." Surely this is the firſt time that *pumps and blocks* ever figured in a ſermon!

containing some Observations on the French Preparations for Invasion, and on the Mode of National Defence, &c. 8vo. Pp. 52. 1s. 6d. Gales, Sheffield; Johnson, London.

MUCH, nay radically, as we differ from Mr. Taylor, on many important points of religion and politics, we cannot withhold our tribute of applause from one of the most animated and most eloquent discourses which has been published during the present contest. The Right and Duty of defensive War, which none but fools who misunderstand, or fanatics who misrepresent the Scriptures, can possibly question, are here perspicuously explained, and forcibly inculcated; and the Appendix contains many judicious remarks on the designs and resources of our enemy, and on the means of opposing them with success.

On the origin and principles of the French Revolution; on the American Rebellion; on the *late* war; on the ministers who waged it; and on religious *toleration*, and parliamentary reform, the author's notions are as crude and as erroneous, as they are clear and correct on the subjects abovementioned.

The Obligation and Mode of keeping a public Fast. A Sermon, preached at the Parish Church of Rempstone, Nottinghamshire, on Friday, May 25, 1804. By Edward Pearson, B. D. Rector, 12mo. Pp. 32. 6d. Tupman, Nottingham; Hatchard, London.

WE never take up a book written by this able divine, and found churchman, without a strong expectation of being edified by its perusal. Nor has this expectation ever yet been disappointed. In the sermon before us Mr. Pearson considers the necessary mode of keeping a public fast in a proper point of view, and explains it to the satisfaction of every good Christian. It is a discourse of great merit, and ought to be universally read.

MISCELLANIES.

The Triad, addressed to the People of the United Empire, in the Beginning of a Storm; the best Bower, Sheet, and spare Anchors a-head. 8vo. Pp. 30. 1s. Hatchard, 1804.

UNDER this quaint title, we have three Essays, which the author distinguishes as metaphysical, political, and poetical. The subjects are, Faith, Hope, and Charity. Of these Essays the first is incomparably the best. It contains a most serious and impressive appeal to the consciences of the immoral and the irreligious. The second has no relation to its professed subject, except in the closing sentence;—"Let us entertain the firm HOPE, that our monarch may long be preserved as the guardian of our isles; and when he ceases to exist, we will combine loyalty with religion, while we repeat our orisons: "Our Father, which art in Heaven!" The poetical Ode to Charity is not above mediocrity. The sentiments, however, of the whole composition are excellent; and it displays good sense combined with good principles.

Strictures

Strictures upon the Merits of Young Roscius. By J. Jackſon, 8vo. Pp. 77. 2s. 6d. Robinſons, 1804.

MR. JACKSON, we underſtand, is the manager of the Edinburgh Theatre, and congratulates himſelf highly on having had the *honour* of introducing Maſter William Henry Weſt Betty, *alias* the Young Roſcius, to the notice of a Britiſh audience. Mr. Jackſon repreſents himſelf to have been dreadfully annoyed by the attacks of the Scotch critics, who have not been willing to conſider the little hero of the buſkin, as "a youth preſented by Heaven, and fully inſtructed by the inſpiring voice of nature." Speaking of young Betty's acting, our manager ſays:—"It is one of thoſe ſingularities of nature that neither hiſtory nor tradition can furniſh; but which is now beheld by us, and never can be ſeen again, till the author of all things ſhall, when he thinks meet, condeſcend to endue another ſtripling in embryo, with a ſimilar incredible combination of ſtage endowments for the gratification of cotemporary admirers."

We have not yet had the *honour*—the *felicity*—of ſeeing this theatrical phenomenon, conſequently cannot decide between the Scotch manager and the Scotch critics. We have to obſerve, however, that Mr. Jackſon's performance exhibits nothing that can be termed criticiſm; that the information afforded reſpecting the Young Roſcius is extremely ſcanty; and that the pamphlet is made up of the accounts of controverſies, &c. which can excite no intereſt either in us or the public.

Critical Eſſays on the Dramatic Excellencies of the Young Roscius. By Gentlemen of diſtinguiſhed Literary Talents, and theatrical Amateurs, oppoſed to the Hypercriticiſms of anonymous Writers, who aſſume the Signatures of Juſtus, Ennius, and Crito. Interſperſed with authentic and intereſting Anecdotes of this wonderful Phenomenon, who ſo brightly illumines the theatric Hemiſphere; containing alſo an Account of his Iriſh, Scotch, and Engliſh Provincial and Metropolitan Engagements, &c. &c. Faithfully compiled by J. Biſſet, Muſeum, Birmingham, Author of the Patriotic Clarion, &c. &c. 8vo. Pp. 91. 2s. 6d. Johnſon. 1804.

Would that we had our half-crown again!

THIS is one of the moſt unbluſhing catchpennies that we ever recollect meeting with. It conſiſts of neither more nor leſs than a collection of all the Addreſſes, Epigrams, Impromptus, Eſſays, Letters, and pretended Criticiſms, in all ſhapes, with which the London and provincial newſpapers have been crammed for the laſt three or four months, reſpecting the youth who is affectedly termed the *Young Roscius*. Such compilations may be amuſing to ſome people; but, of ſuch readers, we pity their taſte! Mr. Jackſon's pamphlet, too, is quoted without mercy, four or five pages at a time.

It is long, very long, ſince we witneſſed ſuch a ſpecimen of pamphlet-*making*; and long, *very long*, may it be before we are condemned to witneſs ſuch another.

REVIEWERS

REVIEWERS REVIEWED.

BISHOP HORSLEY'S EUCLID, AND THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

I HAVE long perceived, that the object of the Edinburgh Review is, to run down all literature, that can come in competition with Scotch literature. The degrading manner in which the gentlemen engaged in that work, have ſpoken of General Vallancey, Pinkerton, and ſome later writers, upon Celtic Antiquities, is ſhameful. Even Davis's Celtic Reſearches, though it contains ſome extravagant whims, is a work that deſerves more reſpectful treatment than they have given it. But it cannot be expected, that any Scotchman ſhould forgive an Engliſhman, who refuſes his aſſent to the opinion, which all Scotchmen profeſs to hold of Robert Simſon; that he was the *greateſt mathematician* the world ever ſaw. The truth is, he was no inconſiderable man; but his learning in mathematics was confined, and his powers of invention were very narrow. He is not to be named either with our Cotes, or with his own pupil, the late Matthew Stewart, or with Hamilton, (now an Iriſh Biſhop,) whoſe work upon Conic Sections is far ſuperior to Robert Simſon's, in the purity and elegance of the Demonſtrations. With reſpect to Biſhop Horſley's Euclid, it is obſervable that the Scotch Critic either paſſes over in ſilence, or mentions with a ſlight unwilling commendation, the moſt material alterations that he has made, except where Robert Simſon is concerned. He quarrels with what the Biſhop has given as a demonſtration of the axiom about parallel ſtraight lines, as reſting upon a tacit aſſumption of ſomething not proved. The truth is, that his demonſtration differs from Robert Simſon's only in the brevity of it, his Lordſhip's occupying a few lines, Simſon's many pages. But the *principle* of proof, after all that Simſon has written about it, the ſame with Simſon as with his Lordſhip; and it is as much aſſumed by Simſon as it is by the Biſhop. *He has endeavoured to conceal the fact, that he aſſumes a principle of demonſtration by a vaſt ſhow of theorems, which amount at laſt to nothing, leaving the real principle unproved.*—The Biſhop *aſſumes it*, and *makes no ſecret that he aſſumes it*. The principle is this, that the ultimate meeting of two ſtraight lines, which tend towards one another is a thing inveloped in the very idea of *ſtraightneſs*.—If tending towards one another they do not ultimately meet; one can only be, becauſe one of them at leaſt is not ſtraight. Having proved, therefore, of two ſtraight lines, that they tend towards one another, his Lordſhip concludes, without more ado, that they will meet.

The Scotch Critic taxes Biſhop Horſley with following Simſon, without acknowledging his Lordſhip's obligations to him, in the corrections of the definitions of the eleventh book. Now this is a *downright falſehood* on the part of the Scotch Critic. In the corrections the Biſhop has made of the definitions of the eleventh book, his Lordſhip owes no obligation to Robert Simſon; his Lordſhip's corrections are very different from Simſon's, nor were they ſuggeſted to him, nor indeed could they be ſuggeſted to any one, by any thing Simſon has written. Let any one compare Simſon's Euclid and the Biſhop's, and ſay, where he can find in Simſon's the corollary

rollary which his Lordſhip has added to the definitions of a ſolid angle, the eleventh of the former editions, the tenth of his Lordſhip's. Where he can find in Simſon the corrections which his Lordſhip has made of the ninth definition of the former editions, the eleventh of his Lordſhip's, or the corollary, which his Lordſhip annexed to that definition. There is no part of the work in which his Lordſhip claims to be more original, than in this correction, and theſe two corollaries.

This Critic appears, like many of the Scotch mathematicians, to be little learned in the ancient languages. It may be imputed to his ignorance of the latin language, that he accuſes his Lordſhip of ſpeaking of Simſon as ignorant of the *principles of Geometry*. This is the interpretation, which, in his ignorance of language, he puts upon a ſentence in which the Biſhop ſpeaks of Simſon as not having fallen upon the true principle for the general ſolution of a *particular problem*. To ſpeak of him as generally ignorant of the principles of geometry, would have been indecorous, indeed; but the fact is, that his Lordſhip has ſpoken of him in a very different manner.

It is from the ſame ſort of ignorance, that the Scotch Critic underſtands the Biſhop as boaſting of his own performances in the ſolution, or rather in detailing the ſolution of a very ſimple problem in logarithmical-arithmetic, when in fact he was ſpeaking ironically of the great difficulty that Keil makes of it, which his Lordſhip maintains to be no difficulty at all, and to ſhew that it is none he gives the proceſs. The Biſhop, indeed, ſubjoins a method of his own, of which his Lordſhip has no otherwiſe boaſted, than by aſſerting that it is more eaſy than the method which Keil recommends to avoid the ſuppoſed difficulty of the other, and which ſeems to have been uſed by few beſides his Lordſhip; this is the real fact.

The Scotch Reviewer will find it too hard a taſk to write down, nor will his cenſure reſtrain the circulation of, the Biſhop's work in the Engliſh Univerſities, nor among the Engliſh mathematicians; however he may prevail in the Scotch Univerſities, and among Scotch mathematicians, whoſe learning equals not their prejudice, which knows no bounds, and is illiberal and unjuſt, equally diſhonourable to their individual and national character *.

The Reviewer prefaces his remarks upon the Biſhop's Euclid, with obſervations upon his Lordſhip's former publication, particularly his edition of Sir Iſaac Newton's works. In the Reviewer's zeal to lower the credit of this undertaking, he ſays of the Biſhop's comment upon the Principia, what in my opinion is its beſt eulogium. That it is ſuch a comment as might have been given the very firſt year after the appearance of the original. This is juſt what the Biſhop meant it ſhould be. It could never be his Lordſhip's intention to incumber a comment upon the text of Newton with the elements of that previous knowledge, which the reader ought to bring with him; ſuch as of Trigonometry, the Conic Sections, Mechanics, Optics, &c.; or to explain the advancements in ſcience that have been made ſince the time of Newton, by the applica-

* This remark is certainly too general and too ſevere; and our reſpect for the Scotch literati and men of ſcience, among whom we know many diſtinguiſhed examples of eminent genius, learning, knowledge, and talents, united with the moſt honourable liberality of ſentiment, is too great to ſuffer it to paſs without notice. EDITOR.

tion

tion of his principles. Such comments are always voluminous in a degree to be diſguſting. They are always dull, and often more obſcure than the text they ſhould illuſtrate. His Lordſhip's intention was ſimply to clear away the difficulty and obſcurity, in which Sir Iſaac Newton's peculiar manner of writing, has left many parts of his great work involved. This, and neither more nor leſs than this, is the duty of a Commentator; and this certainly might have been done, by any one ſufficiently verſed in the pure and the mixed mathematics, the year after the Principia was publiſhed.

In my opinion there is nothing wanting in this work, but the life of the great man, of whoſe mind the work itſelf was intended to be, what it really is, the perfect tranſcript moſt judiciouſly preſerved. This deſideratum, written by his Lordſhip, in his uſual nervous and manly ſtyle, in that claſſical manner, which gives an uncommon zeſt to every thing that he writes, would have been a compliment due to the philoſophic genius of Newton, and not unbecoming of him, by whom it might have been ſo ably executed. I remain, Sir, your faithful and obedient ſervant,

Weſtminſter, Nov. 1804. ΔΕΛΤΑ.

THE SLAVE TRADE, AND THE EDINBURGH REVIEW.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

ONE of the diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of your Review is oppoſition to viſionary theories, and adherence to the ſalutary leſſons of experience. This principle you have often occaſion to apply to religion, morals, and politics; and ſometimes to commerce. In your Review of laſt June, you did me the honour to beſtow high praiſe on a Defence of the Slave Trade, which I attempted on the grounds of humanity, juſtice, and policy.

Various cauſes have ſince induced me to inveſtigate that ſubject much more minutely, extenſively, and deeply; and I am now preparing a work in two volumes, which I flatter myſelf you will not find unworthy of your attention. A preface to that performance will review the ſeveral criticiſms that have been offered upon my late pamphlet. Of theſe, the moſt gratifying are your's, which has ſpoken in ſo very handſome and high terms of the object, plan, and execution; and the Edinburgh Review, which has beſtowed THIRTY-THREE pages of the cloſeſt review print to a pamphlet of ninety pages of a large and open type, has endeavoured to controvert the ſtatements, and overturn the arguments; but has endeavoured to no purpoſe.

There are many conſiderations which render the miſcarriage of this undertaking of the Edinburgh Reviewer particularly ſtriking; and peculiarly pleaſing to the friends of the old ſyſtem of commerce which experience has ſanctioned, and which has rendered our Weſt-India Colonies ſuch abundant ſources of wealth, revenue, and ſtrength to the Mother Country. Whatever may be the defects of the Edinburgh Review, in point of political principles, liberal and juſt criticiſm, want of ability cannot be fairly imputed to ſome of their writers. The article in queſtion bears every intrinſic evidence that it is the workmanſhip of one of their beſt hands. It exhibits ingenuity, invention, literary talents; and in ſhort

wants

wants nothing requiſite to critical inveſtigation, but impartial ſtatement, logical deduction, and truth. Why does it want thoſe qualities? Becauſe the profeſſed judge is really the advocate of a ſide, and cannot make more of his client's caſe. The Reviewer, according to the natural and uſual mode of a pleader, preſents the evidence on one ſide, and not on the other. To undo my ſtatements and arguments, the Reviewer betakes himſelf to a repetition of the aſſertions made by Meſſrs. Clarkſon and Wilberforce, in ſundry pamphlets and ſpeeches; alſo to quotations from the evidence which the Old Jewry Club, and their agent Mr. Clarkſon collected through the country, and induced to deliver teſtimony before the committee. Our Critic refers to the witneſſes, without any analyſis of their teſtimony; without diſtinguiſhing the large maſs of vague aſſertion and opinion from the very ſmall quantity of ſpecific fact; without conſidering what aſſeverations of that cloud of witneſſes contradicted themſelves, and violated every rule of probability and moral evidence. Our judge lumps them altogether, and by one round and comprehenſive affirmation, declares them all worthy of belief. He careſully avoids the oppoſite evidence adduced by the firſt commercial, military, and naval characters; except ſo far that he ſummarily deſcribes them all as undeſerving of credit. Our *judge* farther aſſumes his clients to have demonſtrated a poſition which they have hitherto only affirmed. "Calculations (he ſays) have demonſtrated that the continuance of the trade is not at all neceſſary for keeping up the preſent ſtock of ſlaves, or even for inſuring their gradual multiplication."—No calculation has demonſtrated this poſition, and no calculation can demonſtrate it. For it there are no data, but what refer to particular caſes; and againſt it there is one general datum founded on a phyſical fact.—Throughout the colonies there is not one negro woman to two men, conſequently propagation muſt decreaſe. All the calculations that a thouſand Prices could bring together, never could prove that men would increaſe and multiply without a due proportion of women.

It is not ſurpriſing that the Edinburgh Reviewer, with all his ingenuity and ability, could not ſtate authentic facts, or adduce ſound and forcible arguments, to defend a cauſe which entirely reſts on chimerical ſpeculation; and neither on truth, reaſon, expediency, virtue, nor religion. The Reviewer really affords a very ſtriking inſtance of the ſtrength of that cauſe, which he has tried to attack. Having toiled for thirty-three pages, and in his labour manifeſted great power, yet done nothing effectual; he has clearly ſhewn, that nothing effectual is to be done, for overturning a ſyſtem which ſaves many myriads from the ſword and famine; and which conſtitutes ſuch a momentous ſource of private and public opulence, and of national force to the Britiſh Empire.

I know, Mr. Editor, you would not wiſh this country to ſacrifice her commercial proſperity to wild ſchemes of innovation; but muſt join me in deprecating the application of chimerical theory to trade, as well as to government and legiſlation. France and her St. Domingo negroes have as ſtrongly borne teſtimony to the pernicious effects of haſtily ſubverting long eſtabliſhed ſyſtems, found on the whole beneficial, as France and her Corſican Tyrant!

Yours, with great reſpect,

Oxnam, Roxboroughſhire,
Nov. 15, 1804.

J. H.

THE

THE MONTHLY MAGAZINE.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,

I READ the other day by chance the half-yearly retrospect of Domestic Literature, published, July 28, in the Monthly Mag. on which, permit me as a correspondent, to make a few remarks. What we have been long accustomed to, we seldom think of doubting, as to its truth, propriety, or ornament. This must account for the readers of the Monthly Magazine not suggesting to the editors the utter want of meaning, service, or end of such a retrospect of literature as this. It is equally useless to the writer, and reader, as it can neither correct the former, nor direct the latter. Here is a history and examination of British publications for six months, with extracts and recommendations crammed into 37 pages; three fourths of the space of which is occupied by works printed by Phillips, and got up by, or under the direction of, that self-recommended, *book-making* junto, Dr. Aikin, and company. To those poor authors, who happen to publish out of the sphere or influence of this connection, and whose names are dragged in for no other purpose than to make this "retrospect" *appear* a general one, it can neither do good nor harm, as they must necessarily, from their brevity, approve without service, and censure without effect. Their remarks on philology and criticism seem to be introduced merely for the sake of striking a side blow at your critical journal, and the Edinbro' company; for after having named all the others, they have nothing to say *for* or *against them*, except that the "British Critic," although they do not like it, is not so bad as yours; and that the Analytical, which was abandoned in 1799, (mentioned in this half-yearly review of literature in *one thousand eight hundred and four!!*) notwithstanding it was conducted by gentlemen of *great ability*,* and on a plan of *perfect* impartiality, *declined in sale*, and was given up (*probably on this account*) in the year above-mentioned. *O! tempora, Oh! mores*, when *great ability* and *perfect impartiality* should be the cause of a review declining in sale!!!!!! Of the religion or politics of this latter mentioned journal, I believe there is little doubt. The former could not stand in their way of impartiality, for it was well known they *had none*, and the latter they never dare make known! But to return to our critic—I find it was left to you, Messrs. Editors of the Antijacobin Review, to be "the first and foremost in abuse and intolerance," to "lavish the most rancorous and insulting epithets," on those who differed from you in opinion, &c. &c. As they have done you the honour to allow that you take the lead, even of the Scottish crew, I must inform you that nothing but uncommon perseverance and industry will enable you to keep it,

"For emulation hath a thousand sons,"

And the toe of this "monthly," comes so near your heel, that he "galls your kibe." From what strange obscuration of politeness and propriety could you thus offend this *moderate* and WELL-MANNERED society of gentlemen critics? *They never deviate from their regular business* to insult and abuse, nor "foster antipathies against certain political or religious dogmata;" no, their whole conduct is a convincing proof of THEIR impartiality. I

* Probably Aikin, and Co.

consider,

consider, Mr. Editor, that your reputation requires *some acknowledgement* of this strange and unjustifiable conduct, and recommend that you do penance in a *sheet* by way of expiation. Whatever was left for you, ye vulgar and ungentlemanly editors, it remained for the proprietors of the "Monthly Magazine," to "dart like comets from the sphere of vulgar prejudices," not to steal the celestial fire of reason, but reflect the oblique moonshine of conceit. It remained for *them* to put the finishing stroke to the science of criticism; to write no books but what they review, and review no books but what they write * and therefore *do* or *should* understand. This latter consideration is of no trifling importance, and entirely secures them from the reproach of condemning what may happen to be beyond their comprehension. Some six months ago, there was a long dispute between the "Critical Review," and the author of some strictures on the Chinese language, who, *sans ceremonie*, accused each other of the most profound ignorance; and after a very obstinate, and (on the one side) expensive literary warfare, with much confident and, (to me) learned, assertion, the question was left where they found it, undecided! This reminds me of a blind man, who, it is said, for *his amusement* counted the number of letters in the bible. If he *did* count them, he was a fool for his trouble, because he had only to assert a given number to obtain the same credit, and let those who disputed it *count after him!* But to return to our magazine reviewers. How much are their readers to give them credit for, when they say that, "this book possesses considerable merit," or that, "may be read with advantage," &c. &c.? It is merely saying that they must say *something*, and therefore they say *any thing*, which they consider is better than *nothing*, which is questionable. I could not help smiling, to find them frightened at the title page of the "Gazetteer of Scotland;" but as Lavater says, *we are* physiognomists *in every thing*! I must take the liberty of differing from them as to the labours of the missionary society, and lament that the inhabitants of the South sea should think so ill of the civilized world as the ignorance and fanaticism of these adventurers must lead them to. I allow, with them, that it is "throwing light upon the nature of the human mind," but, alas! only to render its "darkness visible!" A Chinese magistrate proved himself a century or two before these enthusiasts, who, hearing that two of them, a Baptist and a Methodist, had been quarrelling about the method of saving the soul of one of his countrymen, after reproving them for offering their instructions on points where they differed themselves, *ordered them both into prison till they agreed!!!*

I remain, Mr. Editor, with respect, your's,

St. James's Square, A.
Wolverhampton, Oct. 9, 1804.

---

* If the reader will take the trouble to look over their retrospects of literature, he will find that the most trifling production brought out by this literary club, or *firm* of Aikin and Co. occupies more space than an Encyclopedia, published by another concern.

LIFE OF NAPOLEON AND THE EUROPEAN MAGAZINE.

TO THE EDITORS, &c.

GENTLEMEN,

I CALL on you for juſtice, and ſure I am, that no claim of the kind can be unattended to by you, even for a moment.

The European Magazine, when reviewing a work called "The Life of Napoleon, *as it ſhould be handed down to Poſterity*," ſpeaks as follows: "Whoever takes up this volume with the expectation of being informed of the life of Buonaparté will be diſappointed. It is in truth a mere romance, in which the names of ſome of the French revolutioniſts are introduced; but the train of adventures the heroes are made to take a part in, are fictitious and improbable."

I beg leave to ſubmit to you, Gentlemen, that the readers of the above might, and moſt probably would ſuppoſe, that the author of the work meant to avail himſelf of the advantages which a book would poſſeſs by giving information of the life of Buonaparté, and therefore the public is cautioned againſt being tricked into a purchaſe.

Any attempt to impoſe upon the public would receive condign puniſhment from the periodical publications, whoſe province and chief honour it is, to ſhield that public from impoſition. Whatever may be the defects of the work, I indulge myſelf in the hope, that the following facts will honourably acquit me of any crime of the kind, and I have tranſmitted my defence to the other Reviewers, that my innocence may be generally known at the tribunal of criticiſm.

The work, Gentlemen, was firſt advertiſed in the following words. "This day is publiſhed, in one Volume, the Life of Napoleon, as it ſhould be handed down to Poſterity, *a Novel*." and in the ſubſequent advertiſements, the following addition was made: "Being an attempt to combine with adventure, ſuch reflections ariſing out of the characters, that the work may not be deemed unworthy the peruſal of the moraliſt and politician, as well as the *novel reader*."

This, with the title page, I hope would be ſufficient, to diſcharge me from any imputation of any attempt to receive money of the public under falſe pretences; but to what I have ſaid, I beg leave to add the evidence in my behalf, of the Critical Reviewers, who have liberally uſed words to the following effect? "The public will ſee, *by the title page*, that this *is not* intended as the real life of Buonaparté."

Pardon me, Gentlemen, for having taken up ſo much of your time, in a matter of ſo little importance to you; but which I aſſure you will excuſe me, if I conſider it of ſome conſequence to myſelf, for the man who can be ſilent, or eaſy, under unmerited imputation, however his circumſtances may ſhield him from any embarraſſing conſequences, either regards but little his own character, or treats with contempt the opinions of the world.

I am, Gentlemen,

Your obedient ſervant,

Auguſt 4, 1804. J. M——D.

MISCELLANEOUS.

An Enquiry into the Merits of Mr. Pitt's Return to Power.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

ALTHOUGH ſeveral months have elapſed ſince the preſent adminiſtration was formed, under the auſpices of Mr. Pitt, and common ſenſe, and candour, and decency, entertained a hope that the aſperity, with which it was attacked at firſt, would be ſoftened; yet as diſappointment will perſevere in venting its rancorous malignity on the ſervants of the crown, a few plain obſervations on the ſubject may not, perhaps, be altogether uſeleſs; and if in any, however ſmall, degree beneficial, no medium of communication can preſent itſelf ſcarcely ſo deſirable as the Review, Sir, which is conducted by you.

The late adminiſtration being at length convinced that it poſſeſſed not, nor was able to regain, the confidence of the public, determined to retire; and his Majeſty was, thereby, neceſſarily induced to place the government of the country in other hands. That Mr. Pitt ſhould be the ſtateſman to whom his Majeſty would immediately reſort, was the concurrent opinion of all parties at the time: accordingly a long interview takes place between the King and Mr. Pitt, the particulars of which muſt be known accurately to very few, but of which it is the common general impreſſion that Mr. Pitt propoſed to his Majeſty the formation of an adminiſtration which ſhould comprehend the talents and political influence of all thoſe diſtinguiſhed characters who had concurred in one common opinion of the incapacity of Mr. Addington's adminiſtration. To this propoſal his Majeſty is, generally, believed to have acceded with the ſingle perſonal exception of Mr. Fox—with a confidence which reminds one of the poet Cowper's account of a modern patriot whom he deſcribes to be moſt confident when palpably moſt wrong, it is by ſome affirmed that this recommendation of Mr. Fox to his Majeſty's notice was not ſincerely and honeſtly made by Mr. Pitt, or that if it were, it was moſt eaſily and weakly abandoned by him. This aſſertion however vehemently and *conſiſtently* made, is one of that gratuitous deſcription, which never influence the mind of any thinking man—and as no one legitimate inference can be drawn from a ſpeculation merely arbitrary, it is a waſte of words and time to advert any farther to this particular point. Of the recommendation itſelf much might be ſaid with reference to his Majeſty, who rejected it, and to Mr. Pitt, from whom it proceeded. It would require ſome ſmall degree of ingenuity to anſwer ſatisfactorily one objection only (even if no other had been declared) which it is not difficult to imagine, might immediately occur to the mind of his Majeſty. Mr Fox had been removed from the privy council—on the very extenſive meaning of that meaſure it is unneceſſary to enlarge—thoſe who remember, or who will refer to the circumſtances which occaſioned the removal of Mr. Fox, muſt perceive that it declared no leſs ſevere a judgment on him than that his views and declarations were hoſtile to the intereſts of his country, and particularly ſo to the monarchical part of our conſtitution; and, conſequently, that he was an object of juſt jealouſy to his Sovereign—if, therefore, on the propoſition

being made to the King, that Mr. Fox ſhould be reſtored to his privy council, and admitted into his cabinet, his Majeſty had required it to be pointed out to him, what Mr. Fox had done, by which he could be induced to alter the opinion once ſo ſtrongly entertained againſt him; it is beyond the reach of my humble intellect to ſuggeſt to this enquiry any other anſwer on which the fainteſt ſhadow of reaſon could fall, than that the circumſtances of the times were altered, and with them the peculiar apprehenſions from thoſe political ſentiments, the declaration of which had drawn down upon him the moſt ſignal mark of his Sovereign's ſenſe of offence. I think this to be the only plauſible anſwer that could be made; but is it ſatisfactory? unleſs the ſentiments themſelves be changed, what ſecurity could his Majeſty have, that when in power, Mr. Fox would not either create or avail himſelf of other circumſtances favourable for the ſucceſsful practical accompliſhment of his political tenets; and where ſhall we look for any manifeſtation of this change of ſentiment in Mr. Fox? From the time of the memorable removal of him from the Privy Council, with the conſent and approbation, no doubt, of the Grenville party, to the end of the laſt war, can this party point out, I will be contented with one ſolitary circumſtance, by which their then formidable opponent ſeemed to have purged himſelf of his peccant matter? Was it at the time of the mutiny in the fleet that Mr. Fox evinced theſe ſymptoms of purification? when his friend Mr. Sheridan rallied his ſtrength of talents round his country, and in his apprehenſion of public danger, forgot for a moment his hoſtility to the then exiſting adminiſtration. I, Sir, am no panegyriſt of Mr. Sheridan; he has done his country much miſchief, but whatever may have been his motives, whether pure or baſe, on ſome few occaſions, he has in point of fact "rendered the ſtate ſome ſervice." I allude particularly to his conduct, at the time above alluded to of the mutiny; alſo at the time of his Majeſty's illneſs in the year 1801, and at the commencement of the preſent war; but never by accident or deſign, has Mr. Fox been found, what his friends ſay of Mr. Sheridan, *tripping*. There may be a mutiny in the fleet, there may be an experimental peace made, there may be a war entered into as juſt and neceſſary as ever the honour and ſecurity of a nation may demand; yet at the former criſis his tottering country will in vain look out for help from him, if he be unemployed in the councils of the ſtate. At the peace he may rejoice, but why?—becauſe it may be a glorious one for our enemy; and when this honourable war we are compelled to wage, he will harangue in the ſenate of his country in defence of the ſame enemy, and in ſuch a ſtrain of defence too, that he ſhall be called by a now forgiving friend, a pander to French baſeneſs. Never, certainly, did any of the hired orators of Athens aſſiſt the purpoſe of Philip of Macedon more effectively, than did the man of the people, the champion of liberty in this country, the purpoſe of Buonaparté of Corſica! With reſpect to the King, therefore, it may be, perhaps, a ſtrange political infatuation which dims my reaſon, but I ſhall never be induced to blame his Majeſty, for refuſing to admit Mr. Fox to his councils, as long as he can form an effective adminiſtration without him and his friends. The conſiderations upon the ſubject are, however, very different, when we view it with reference to Mr. Pitt's propoſal, from thoſe which preſent themſelves on his Majeſty's rejection.—That Mr. Pitt ſhould be diſpoſed to make an *experiment* which a large party in the country ſeemed to deſire, that he ſhould be inclined to forget

all

all former oppoſitions and irritations, and that he ſhould be willing to bear a ſtateſman of the higheſt talents and moſt varied attainments, and alſo of the moſt engaging manners, as a rival near his throne of power, caſt not, ſurely, any unworthy reflections on the magnanimity and liberality of his mind. The common declamation againſt coalitions is moſt idle, and abſurd, and muſt ariſe from ignorance of the nature of political conteſts, particularly as they ſpring from the ſpirit of the Engliſh conſtitution. If aſperities of language, though frequently repeated, and differences of opinion, though wide and long protracted, afford a juſt pretext for perpetuity of reſentments, it might be in the power of an artful and ambitious prince to take large ſtrides over the liberties of this country, and to deſtroy the ſalutary influence ariſing from the wholeſome reciprocal checks of the monarchical and democratical parts of our form of government upon each other. It is the expectation of theſe political reconciliations that holds out the alarm againſt deſtructive innovations on the rights of any condition in the ſtate: it was this drawing together of formerly oppoſite parties that ſaved this country from being at one time the prey of abſolute power, and at another the miſerable deſolation of republican waſte; but unfortunately for Mr. Fox, his coalitions have been remarkable for the moſt apparent violent relinquiſhment of former opinions, either by himſelf or the party with whom he has formed the co-operations. I am aware that his friends obſerve, that it is not he, who has ever changed his ſentiments, but the ſeveral parties which have at different periods connected themſelves with him. It may be ſo, perhaps: but what confidence could Mr. Fox ever honeſtly have repoſed in Lord North, or can he now repoſe in Lord Grenville or Mr. Windham? As far as the views and politics of different ſtateſmen have been exhibited *in parliament* during the laſt ten years, the hoſtility between Mr. Fox and his new friends has been more keen, than between him and Mr. Pitt. With regard to the declarations and conduct of Mr. Fox *out of Parliament*, all parties but his own felt equal and ſimilar indignation at them. In parliament, however, Mr. Fox and Mr. Pitt have differed, generally ſpeaking, upon particular meaſures. Mr. Fox and Mr. Windham upon firſt principles. The political views of one, it was for years repeatedly ſaid by the other, are abſolutely inconſiſtent with the exiſtence of the conſtitution of this country, and can lead to no other iſſue, than the moſt dreadful democratical revolution, while it was for as long a period, and as repeatedly retorted, the views of the other are full of ruin to the liberties of the people, and to the enjoyment of every object of national value. Let any adherent to Mr. Fox deny, if he can, that not twelve months ſince paſt, the language of the party was, Mr. Addington's adminiſtration is unequal to the preſent criſis; the circumſtances of the times will not afford any pretext to Mr. Pitt attempting any violent and arbitrary plans, and we would rather have him in power now than Mr. Addington. *Any party but the Grenvilles*, there is in them a certain wildneſs, unfeelingneſs, inſolence, and wrongheadedneſs, which render their very talents, eminent as they are, moſt miſchievous. This, Sir, was the language of Mr. Fox's friends. It is not mine. It is really quite ludicrous. We hear at this day Foxite talk of Lord Grenville and Mr. Windham; the former, who was an inſolent, impracticable ſtateſman, whoſe haughty mind could not comprehend, becauſe it would not deſcend to the conſideration of the ordinary habits and feelings of mankind, and who was utterly deficient in that beſt of all ſenſes, common ſenſe, is now

a cool, temperate, ſtateſman, has a profound comprehenſion, and takes the moſt extenſive view of political relations; and Mr. Windham, who was a mere viſionary, a fanciful metaphyſician; one a pleaſant ſpeaker to be ſure, but, God knows, half mad, is now a moſt enlightened, practicable, politician; while, it muſt be univerſally allowed, of both theſe ſtateſmen, that their refuſal to come in with Mr. Pitt, without Mr. Fox, is moſt *honourable*. (I have a word or two to ſay preſently, upon this point of honour.)

Now, Sir, I am deſirous to know, what have Mr. Windham and Lord Grenville done, that has wrought this prodigious change in the opinion of Mr. Fox's friends? I have heard, that when the two parties were firſt *approximating* to the *co-operation* which terminated in the *coalition*, Mr. Sheridan obſerved, Mr. Fox, by his union with Lord North, gave a ſevere blow to his own political conſiſtency, and by the propoſed union with the Grenvilles, will entirely deſtroy all his credit upon that point; and I cannot forbear from thinking that a conſiſtent Foxite ſhould entertain better hopes of the preſent adminiſtration, without the Grenvilles, than it would with them; becauſe the more error is likely to ariſe from the preſence of miſchievous talent, than from the feebleneſs of inferior capacity; but it is ſaid now, that to reconcile all theſe difficulties, the new friends of Mr. Fox are, at length, convinced that they have been in an error for many years, and therefore now they are deſirous of exhibiting the firſt proof of great minds, and the brighteſt pledge of amendment by moſt magnanimouſly confeſſing their conſciouſneſs of long indulged miſtake, and that under the firm opinion that Mr. Fox has formed the moſt perfect views of the real intereſts of this country; they have placed themſelves under his protection, and conſider him the head of their political intereſts. One of the moſt intelligent, and powerful, and ſturdy of their ſupporters, has declared, that he at laſt has attained to an accurate knowledge of facts, in the miſapprehenſion of which he was long poſſeſſed with the idea of the excellence of Mr. Pitt's public conduct, and that he is now of opinion, that moſt of the miſchiefs which the French revolution has left as a legacy to the world, are the reſult of the deſtructive courſe of politics adopted by Mr. Pitt. Probably, in ſome of theſe ſad and irretrievable miſtakes Lord Grenville, and Mr. Windham may have fallen, how heavily muſt the remembrance of them ſit upon their ſouls! and yet how conſolatory in their affliction to be received like penitent children, into the relenting boſom of Mr. Fox! Methinks, if this ſort of penitentiary confeſſion ſhould be really made, I ſhould be ſomewhat diſpoſed to ſuſpect its ſincerity. This conviction has flaſhed upon their minds at an awkward time, when they were diſappointed, and irritated. They are not dull men:—and while in power had means greater than they can have at preſent, of acquiring a variety of political knowledge, and of obſerving facts with greater accuracy, and nicety, and of tracing every thing to its ſecret; yet then they were all peremptorineſs one way, and it is juſt now they are diſcovering their miſtake. Probably, we ſhall learn, Sir, what are theſe ſources of information, and may be permitted to retain our former ſentiments till the film ſhall be withdrawn from our eyes. Thus much for the propoſal and rejection of Mr. Fox, and the union betwen him and Lord Grenville and his party. It will be remembered, however, that Mr. Fox himſelf has publicly acquitted Mr. Pitt of the leaſt diſhonour in not having declined the wiſhes of his Majeſty, when the principle of excluſion

was

ons preferred. There was not any actual or implied underſtanding between theſe two ſtateſmen, by which either of them was obligated to refuſe a political ſtation without the aſſiſtance of the other. Mr. Fox expreſsly affirmed thus in his memorable reply to the attack made upon him by the preſent Attorney General. Unfettered, therefore, by any ſuch bonds as theſe, and obedient to the commands of his Majeſty, Mr. Pitt undertakes the formation of a new adminiſtration, in which he offers to Lords Grenville and Spencer prominent ſituations. This offer is by theſe noblemen *ultimately* declined. I ſay ultimately, becauſe their deciſion upon the ſubject was, as ſome very confidently aſſert, not inſtantaneous.

That Mr. Pitt ſhould ſeek the aſſiſtance of theſe noblemen and their friends, was the confident expectation of all; that he might entertain a *hope* that his application to them would not be fruitleſs, ſubjects him not juſtly to the imputation of forming extravagant expectations: that his application was fruitleſs, has excited the ſurpriſe, and rouſed the indignation, of at leaſt as many of the former political adherents to theſe noblemen, as it has conciliated the affection of their former political antagoniſts. Mr. Pitt had been the object of the frequent praiſe of the Grenville party; they had declared that they would for a time at leaſt withdraw their oppoſition from any Government at the head of which he might be placed. It would not be ſtraining their ſeveral and repeated declarations to affirm, that the mere abſence of attack was not the extreme point of their promiſe. Yet, when on the very firſt meaſure of Mr. Pitt's, they opened an inceſſant and vigorous aſſault upon him, and were charged by the Miniſter with the inconſiſtency of their oppoſition with their former declarations reſpecting him, Lord Temple, as an organ of the party, was diſpoſed to deny that theſe terms of praiſe, and theſe pledges of non-reſiſtance, were ever uttered or given—till preſſed moſt ſtrongly, his Lordſhip, with no exceſs of graciouſneſs, certainly, was driven to declare that, if he had formerly thought and ſpoken of his relation in language of eulogium, he was not at that time inclined to the ſame opinions. When it was publicly known that the Grenville family and party had refuſed their aſſiſtance to Government, the ſeveral reaſons aſſigned by the friends of Mr. Fox, and by his Lordſhip, for that refuſal, were contradictory. By the former it was ſaid that a coalition having previouſly been formed between the parties, the Grenvilles could not, as men of honour, enter into any Adminiſtration from which he was excluded; while Lord Grenville himſelf denies the exiſtence of any ſuch political underſtanding as made his acceptance of the ſituation offered to him impoſſible, under the circumſtances of the engagement, and confines his plea for declining the ſame to the principle of excluſion, which was adopted with reference to one ſtateſman. It is needleſs, therefore, to diſcuſs the queſtion of *honour*, in the Grenvilles adhering to Mr. Fox; becauſe, unleſs there had been a previous coalition, or, to uſe the ſofter phraſe of the time—a co-operation, or, to adopt the ſtill ſofter term, an approximation between the two parties, there could not be any honour in adhering to a compact, which was never entered into; and Lord Grenville negatives the exiſtence of any ſuch compact, at leaſt as far as influencing his deciſion upon the ſubject. Perhaps there is more difficulty preſſing on the Grenvilles on the ſcore of honour in their deſertion of Mr. Pitt, than in their union with Mr. Fox. It is to be lamented, that the ſpirit of party has attributed motives to Lord Grenville ſo diſhonourable, as to remove entirely any credit from the repreſentation of facts, which, if they

were true, would moſt amply juſtify the ſtrongeſt conviction of his Lordſhip's unworthineſs and ingratitude. The foul aſperſion which ſome dare throw upon his Lordſhip is, that after it was known to him, that Mr. Fox was excluded from the new Adminiſtration, and after Mr. Pitt's propoſal to his Lordſhip, of reſuming his former ſeat in the Cabinet, he conſented to accept the ſame; when a moſt illuſtrious Perſonage declared that the ſtateſman, be he who he might, who, at that juncture, did not adhere to Mr. Fox, would be the object of his marked and uniform diſpleaſure, whenever the opportunity offered of his ſhewing his favour or diſapprobation; and this moſt improbable ſtory concludes by telling, that upon this declaration, Lord Grenville retracted his conſent, withdrew himſelf from Mr. Pitt, and reſolved to unite with Mr. Fox in an immediate and concerted oppoſition to the new Government, and under the high auſpices of the illuſtrious character, whoſe denunciation appalled the lofty ſpirit of the Houſe of Grenville. You and I, Sir, who have been long accuſtomed to venerate the virtues and patriotiſm of the Grenville party, (their talents are *now* even with the friends of Mr. Fox beyond queſtion,) will never credit this tale, until we receive confirmation of it "ſtrong as proofs of Holy Writ." That Lord Grenville, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Windham ſhould deſert a Sovereign, who had never deſerted them, (for, be it remembered, that they left—I will not ſay, deſerted him, when they retired from Adminiſtration,) who, on the former and his family, had ſhowered honours upon honours, is a black tale, if it be a true one:—Who that contemplates the admirable ſenſe and manly mind of Lord Spencer; who that admires the generous chivalrous ſpirit of Mr. Windham, will believe either capable of acting upon a baſe, and degrading ſpeculation?—It is impoſſible!—They could not proceed upon an idea that he, who would have repoſed his confidence in them, would, by divine viſitation, be not long permitted to ſupport them; but that another would riſe to power ſoon, and reward them for deſerting him, to whom they were all indebted for whatever eminence their ambition had attained.—Yet, Sir, groſsly improbable as this vile tale is, why did not Lord Grenville and his party, and Lord Spencer, accept the offers of their Sovereign? There was no pledge to Mr. Fox—Lord Grenville affirms there was not. Were the times of ſuch unparalleled difficulty, as to make them in deep humility feel themſelves unequal, with the aſſiſtance of Lord Melville and Mr. Pitt, to direct the affairs of Government with effect?—Surely, the dangers of the State were not ſo complicated and tremendous in the year 1803, as at very many periods during the Adminiſtration of which they formed a part?—In the year 1803 we were, certainly, involved in a war with an enemy, who threatened to carry deſolation to the metropolis of our country; but in the year 98, we were alſo involved in a war, in which the like menaces were denounced againſt us: for ſome perilous years, during which theſe noblemen and their friends thought themſelves, and were thought by their country, together with Mr. Pitt and Lord Melville, to form a moſt efficient Government; war from without, and treaſon from within, were conjointly oppreſſing and endangering us. The War in 1803 was popular with all thoſe, who admitted the neceſſity and juſtice of the laſt war; and many who diſapproved of the latter war, conceived the preſent to be abſolutely neceſſary, if we ſet any value on our independence and our honour. I cannot, therefore, forbear from thinking that, on a balance of difficulties, thoſe during the greater part of the time, when the Grenvilles were in power, exceeded

both

both in number and intenſity, thoſe which beſet us in the laſt year. Surely, it was not apprehended that Mr. Fox's powers were mightier in oppoſition than formerly, or Mr. Pitt's weaker in defence; each of theſe great characters retained their reſpective capacity: but they will ſay, as Mr. Fox was diſpoſed to give Government his aſſiſtance, we conſider that diſpoſition of importance, ſo far exceeding every other conſideration, that unleſs it be met, and encouraged, Government ſhall not have our aſſiſtance. The charge againſt the Grenvilles, of their having ſaid that one man was alone ſufficient for the Government of the Country, has given great offence; yet has not their conduct aſſented to a very ſimilar propoſition? Where is the great difference between ſaying, one man is alone ſufficient, and, without the aſſiſtance of one man, no other combination of talents or influence can be effectual—(I admit there is ſome difference, but practically, very trifling;) yet in the refuſal of the Grenvilles to come in without Mr. Fox, they expreſsly maintain the latter propoſition, however angrily they may diſclaim the firſt. The principle alſo, of forcing any given ſtateſman, or party, upon the Sovereign, has, in terms, been diſclaimed; but, I aſk again, where is the great difference between the compulſion alluded to, and the virtual aſſertion, that unleſs the Sovereign ſhall receive into his confidence a particular man, the Adminiſtration which ſhall be formed without him, ſhall be oppoſed. If the union of the two former hoſtile parties, has not for its object the removal of Mr. Pitt, or rather of the preſent Adminiſtration, it will be impoſſible to conceive what object it has in view; and if this be its purpoſe, it is equivalent to the one of forcing his Majeſty to receive Mr. Fox. It would be no difficult undertaking, Sir, to proceed in the conſideration of this part of the ſubject; but I have already treſpaſſed much upon you, and will haſten to the remainder of my inquiry. Lord Grenville then, and his party having refuſed to accept any ſeats in the Cabinet, becauſe, as his Lordſhip's letter to Mr. Pitt ſtates, a principle of excluſion has been admitted with reſpect to thoſe, who were to form the Government—what was the courſe Mr. Pitt was to purſue?—There were thoſe who hoped, that he would, under the circumſtances, have told his Majeſty, that he had in vain endeavoured to form an Adminiſtration, which could combine talents and influence ſufficient for the criſis of the times; and that the only one he could form, would not be able to reſiſt the combined forces, which would be marſhalled againſt it; in other words, that he muſt throw his Majeſty into the arms of Mr. Fox. Mr. Pitt, Sir, was an honeſter man, and better loved the King, who had been his benefactor, and the Conſtitution of his Country, than to deſert his King and Conſtitution, becauſe he was deſerted by his old friends—and colleagues.—It was not that he feared the loſs of power, and ſituation, he might have retained both in any Adminiſtration; for it never was thought of, at that time, whatever it may be now, that he ſhould be excluded from any arrangement. The deciſion to which his vigorous mind arrived, was one, for which it is not very unbecoming to aſſert, his Majeſty is under no ſmall obligations to him; and for the principle of which, his Royal Highneſs the Prince of Wales is under ſcarcely inferior obligations. He reſolved to attempt to conduct the affairs of the Empire without the aid of thoſe, whoſe aid he aſked, and even in deſpite of their oppoſition;—He reſiſted the principle of forcing upon the Sovereign any particular man or party; a principle, which one day or other perhaps, the Prince may acknowledge with gratitude; for much do we miſtake his Royal Highneſs,

i: on that, which I muſt term, melancholy event, that ſhall deprive our Country of his Royal Father, he would be well pleaſed with any party in the State, who, under whatever circumſtances of political danger ſhall virtually announce to him, that unleſs he receives Mr. Pitt into his confidence, his Adminiſtration ſhall be oppoſed. Thus, Sir, have I enquired into the circumſtances under which Mr. Pitt reſumed his former high ſtation in the Government of the Country, and feel myſelf fully juſtified in thinking, that from the moment he was commanded by his Majeſty to form a new Adminiſtration to its ultimate arrangement his conduct was marked with liberality to former foes, affection and reſpect for former friends, zeal, for his Sovereign and his Country, and with that lofty intrepidity which has ever marked his public conduct. His meaſures were immediately oppoſed by the irritated and diſappointed Coalition phalanx. No time has elapſed ſufficient to aſcertain the merit of his plans; though it is much to be feared, that they will not have, to uſe a homely phraſe, fair play given to them:—if Lords Lieutenants of Counties, and Colonels of Militia will, becauſe in Parliament they have oppoſed Mr. Pitt's Government, think themſelves privileged to thwart it out of Parliament, though inſtead of implicitly obeying, as it is their duty, the directions communicated, which have received the ſanction of the Legiſlature, impediments, other than thoſe which attach upon every proviſion for the army, will be thrown in the way of Government. I will not enter into any long diſcuſſion upon the merits of the Bill—that a great and ſevere preſſure is removed by it from a large body of the community, and that body, the one which was leaſt able to bear the burthen, cannot be denied by him, who remembers the oppreſſive operations of the ballot; that the pecuniary levies, when it will be neceſſary to make them, ſhould fall upon ſome occaſions unequally, is a circumſtance which occurs upon almoſt every ſubject of public taxation, with the ſingle exception of the Property Tax, which proceeds upon a different principle; upon external property and voluntary expenditure every other tax is formed:—And it was urged againſt the Income Tax, that this principle being in it abandoned, was a fundamental objection to the meaſure; as to the outcry about the Overſeers, it is quite ridiculous: for thoſe who will reflect upon the deſcription of perſons, who fall under the management and controul of the Overſeers of the Poor, will immediately perceive, that not one of this claſs would be admitted into the army. Mr. Windham ſaid, Leave the recruiting ſervice alone—diſencumber it from all reſtrictions and compulſion.—The Bill makes the experiment; but it ſays, if when left to itſelf it does not ſucceed, a ſtimulus ſhall be given to the ſervice, by making it the intereſt of ſeveral perſons to aſſiſt it. I will advert, Sir, to only one more circumſtance, which occurred ſoon after Mr. Pitt's return to power; on his being in a majority not larger, ſmaller even, I believe, than that, ſoon after which Mr. Addington retired from his ſeat, Mr. Sheridan recommended Mr. Pitt to reſign. We remember the ſpirited deciſiveneſs with which this hint was noticed:—now, ſurely, no two ſituations could be leſs alike than thoſe of Mr. Pitt and Mr. Addington. The minority, which drove the latter gentleman from his ſeat, did not ſimply declare, that it diſapproved of this or that meaſure, but that it conſidered his Adminiſtration to have exhibited a long continued ſeries of feeble, contradictory, indeciſive, and ineffecient meaſures; whereas there was as much contrariety of opinion between different parties in the minority againſt Mr. Pitt's Bill, as between the minority collectively conſidered, and the ſupporters

porters of the Bill; while among the numbers which composed the opposition to the measure, there were many, who having approved of the Military Bills, under the late Administration, thought that consistency required them to vote against Mr. Pitt's scheme, yet who are not to be expected to have regularly entered the lists of systematic opposition. The minority against Mr. Addington pronounced its opinion, from experience, of the whole character of an Administration; the minority against Mr. Pitt, of the probable effect of one particular measure, upon speculation. To make the two cases similar, let some time elapse, and then if such a minority as induced Mr. A. to retire, shall declare condemnation of the whole conduct of Mr. Pitt's Administration, I have no hesitation in saying, that it will be his duty also to retire from his post; but, Sir, I confidently entertain a very different hope, I believe that he and his friends in power will be found at any period of inquiry, to have with diligence, activity, and effect, watched over the interests of the country. It is scarcely worth while, but one word, Sir, will I add about the comments which have been made in the common prints of the day, upon his and Lord Melville's visit to the coast. Surely, it is not a fit subject of censure of Ministers, that they employ their leisure time in making themselves eye-witnesses of the actual state of the defence of the country, at the most assailable points, and of paying their personal attentions to the several eminent characters, who were employed for that purpose, at different stations. The ridicule and reprehension of this conduct, are fit only for the page of the hireling paper of a discontented and disappointed party. I am, Sir, with unfeigned wishes for success to every general plan or particular measure, which has for its object our country's good, in a very inferior walk, however, to that in which you move.

Your fellow labourer,

A PLAIN MAN.

Bishop Skinner's Defence of Episcopacy.

TO THE EDITOR.

Sir,

IN the last number of your excellent work, your readers are presented with a letter addressed to Bishop Skinner, in which the writer makes some remarks on that part of the Bishop's Defence of Episcopacy, intitled "A concluding Address to the Episcopalians of Scotland." The remarks in general may easily be perceived to breathe a spirit no wise friendly to the cause of the Scottish Episcopacy, and are evidently intended to shew an inconsistency of conduct in those clergy, who at present are endeavouring to support it. The writer pretends to be far "from calling in question their affection and loyalty to their King, but is at a loss to conceive why they do still refuse to swear allegiance to him, in the manner, and after the precise form, prescribed by the statute; and "if this omission," he adds, quoting the words of Bishop Skinner, "do not proceed from any unworthy opinion respecting the authority of government;" from what cause may I be allowed to ask does it proceed? It has always been observed, Mr. Editor, that there are persons disposed to ask questions which themselves can easily answer; and, I believe, there are few who know any thing at all of the history of the Scotch Episcopal Church, for a century past, and are not aware of the conscientious scruples entertained by the clergy respecting

some

ſome of the ſtate oaths required by law; although I am certain that his Majeſty King George has not, in all his dominions, a claſs of ſubjects more firmly attached to his perſon and government, from principles of the pureſt loyalty, than theſe ſame ſcrupulous clergy. Any oath of allegiance expreſſive of this attachment, and founded on theſe principles, they would moſt readily take, if it could be propoſed to them. But, rather than pretend to dictate to the legiſlature of their country, they will patiently ſubmit even to unjuſt aſperſions, ariſing from the ignorance, or ill nature, of perſons ſo prejudiced againſt them, as the writer of the letter to which I am now alluding. Blinded, indeed, by his prejudice, he does not ſeem to ſee the inaccuracy of his own ſtatement of the caſe; for after inveighing againſt theſe clergy for not taking all the oaths preſcribed by the ſtatute, and obſerving at the ſame time, that the Engliſh clergy officiating in Scotland, have taken the oath of allegiance only at their ordination, he yet concludes his remonſtrance by telling Biſhop Skinner; "If you wiſh, the Engliſh clergy officiating in Scotland ſhould formally teſtify in the manner you require, their approbation and acceptance of thoſe unexceptionable articles of union, which are ſtated in your Appendix, it is but fair that you ſhould formally ſwear allegiance to his Majeſty, *as they have done*, and formally ſubſcribe a declaration of your aſſent to the "Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England." The former, I am ſure, they would willingly do, even as *these English clergy have done*, if the law would admit of their doing it; and the latter they have already done, even before the ſtrange looking admonition to Biſhop Skinner made its appearance. For, it is with much pleaſure, Mr. Editor, that I am able to give you the following information: By appointment of the Right Reverend, the Biſhops of the Scotch Epiſcopal Church, a general meeting of them, and the clergy of their communion, was held in the chapel of the village of Lawrence Kirk, on Wedneſday, the twenty-fourth day of October laſt, the purpoſe of which meeting being to exhibit, in the moſt ſolemn manner, a public teſtimony of their conformity, in doctrine and diſcipline, with the united Church of England and Ireland; it was cheerfully attended by almoſt all the biſhops and clergy, a very few only being kept back either by age or infirmity, or their great diſtance from the place of meeting. After morning-prayer was read, in the uſual manner, the buſineſs of this eccleſiaſtical aſſembly was opened by a diſcourſe from the pulpit, which is ſoon to be publiſhed; and having taken into their ſerious conſideration the obligations which they were laid under to provide, as far as they were able, for the preſervation of truth, unity, and concord, in that ſmall portion of the Church of Chriſt committed to their charge, they were unanimouſly of opinion, that for this purpoſe, it would be highly expedient to give a ſolemn declaration of their aſſent to what are uſually called the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, and to do ſo in the form or words of the ſubſcription, required by the Act of the 32d of his preſent Majeſty, intitled, "An Act for granting Relief to Paſtors, Miniſters, and Lay Perſons, of the Epiſcopal Communion in Scotland." The reſolution entered into, on this ſolemn occaſion, was in the following terms. "Reſolved, therefore, as we now are, by the Grace of Almighty God, to adopt theſe articles, as the public teſt or ſtandard of the religious principles of our Church—We whoſe names are under-written, the biſhops and paſtors of congregations of perſons in the Epiſcopal communion in Scotland, meeting for divine worſhip, at the ſeveral places annexed to our names, do willingly, and *ex animo*, ſubſcribe to the book of articles of religion, agreed upon by the archbiſhops and

and biſhops of both provinces of the realm of England, and the whole clergy thereof, in the convocation holden at London, in the year of our Lord 1562, and we do acknowledge all, and every, the articles therein contained, being in number thirty-nine, beſides the ratification, to be agreeable to the word of God. And we, the ſubſcribing biſhops, have alſo reſolved in future to require from all candidates for holy orders in our Church, previous to their being ordained, a ſimilar ſubſcription."—This account, Sir, you may depend on as genuine, from

A SCOTCH EPISCOPALIAN.

November 10, 1804.

POETRY.

Doggerel Rhimes by Carlo, one of the Performers at the Theatre Drury Lane.

THAT Engliſhmen * call the great nation, French dogs,
Hurts the delicate feelings of Citizen Nogs.
We dogs too, ſo nick-named, reſent the diſgrace,
Of being thus claſſed, with that profligate race;
And we beg to remind worthy Citizen Nogs,
That his nation's a nation of devils—not dogs.
Let none then confound that vile murderous crew
With us, to mankind ever friendly and true,
But give both to devils, and dogs, their juſt due.

SUMMARY OF POLITICS.

IT is not our intention, at this moment, to take a full view of the political ſtate of the continent of Europe, which begins to aſſume ſomewhat of a new aſpect, to ſhew the dawn of *better* days than we have, of late years, been accuſtomed to enjoy. That view we reſerve as a preface to our volume, contenting ourſelves, at preſent, with a few curſory remarks on ſome of the moſt prominent occurrences of the day.

France continues to run, with increaſed rapidity, her career of fraud, perfidy, and oppreſſion. Scarcely had the trembling ſovereigns of Europe recovered from the effects of their terror and indignation (which baſe timidity and crooked policy forbad them to diſplay) at the atrocious murder of the DUKE D'ENGHIEN, which could not be perpetrated without one of the moſt groſs and ſcandalous violations of the rights of neutrality and of the law of nations, which none but barbarians had hitherto openly braved, when they were compelled to witneſs another outrage as ſhameleſs in its nature, though leſs atrocious in its effect;—we allude to the ſeizure of Sir GEORGE RUMBOLD, the repreſentative of the Britiſh Sovereign, at *Hamburgh*. To the timidity and policy which we have noticed, may this daring act, originating in the phrenzied rage of the Corſican monſter, be fairly

* See the harangue of Citizen Nogs (or Nogues) in a late Paris paper.

imputed.

imputed. His tyranny had known no bounds and experienced no opposition; he had ſatiated every bad propenſity, every brutal paſſion of his ferocious mind; he had wantonly trampled upon every right hitherto holden ſacred by the civilized world; he had wantonly broken every treaty which he had concluded; he had ſpurned, with contempt, the independence of neutral and of allied powers; that independence which he had ſolemnly proclaimed and formally ratified, but a few months before; he had, in ſhort, ſacrificed every principle, every law, and every conſideration, conſecrated by religion, morality, juſtice, or general aſſent, to the gratification of his own vanity, and of his own ambition. And he had done all this, not only with impunity, but without a remonſtrance, or even a murmur, on the part of thoſe princes, who had the power, the means of reſiſtance, and who could not fail, unleſs deſerted by the uſual faculties of rational beings, to read their own fate in that of their neighbours. From this long, uninterrupted, race of iniquity, Buonaparté had certainly reaſon to expect that the fulneſs of his power was felt and acknowledged by all, that his will would henceforth conſtitute the public law of Europe, and that the ſimple declaration of his ſupreme pleaſure would ſuffice to ſecure univerſal and implicit obedience. Happy, perhaps, it is for the world, that he was impreſſed with this conviction; ſince it threw him off his guard, made him neglect every precaution which prudence or policy could ſuggeſt, and led him openly to purſue the gratification of his envy, hatred, and malice. By this means he has, to his great, and, it muſt be confeſſed, not unfounded, ſurprize, awakened the fears and called forth the voices of thoſe powers who, at the murder of the Duke D'Enghien, preceded by an act of violence, unprecedented in the hiſtory of civilized countries, had only trembled in ſecret, and obſerved a profound ſilence. What the conſequences of this unexpected ſpirit, this renovated ſenſibility, this tardy alarm, will be, a very ſhort time muſt unfold. What honour, what duty, what intereſt, what ſelf-preſervation preſcribes, it requires no great depth of penetration to diſcover, no extraordinary acuteneſs of judgment to aſcertain. But the influence of theſe high and honourable ſprings of human action has been ſo feeble, for the laſt few years, that we almoſt deſpair of ſeeing it recover its wonted energy and force.

To *argue* upon the lawleſs ſeizure of Sir GEORGE RUMBOLD would be an inſult to the common ſenſe of *Britons*; admitting the truth of every aſſertion which either has been or may be advanced, by the baſe paraſites of the upſtart uſurper, ſtill the act is equally atrocious. He had an eaſy and a legal mode of remedying the evil of which he complained; the preſcribed uſage, and the long eſtabliſhed law of nations, taught him, that he ſhould have applied to the power at whoſe court this miniſter reſided, inſiſted on his immediate return, and publiſhed a manifeſto, addreſſed to the Sovereigns of Europe, complaining of the abuſe of the diplomatic character, and exhibiting the proofs of its exiſtence. But ſuch conduct would have amounted to an acknowledgment, that the law of nations was paramount to the will of the Corſican uſurper, and would have reduced him to a level with the regular and eſtabliſhed Sovereigns of Europe; an indignity which his pride could not brook, to which his vanity could not ſubmit, and which was little compatible with his preſent views and his ultimate deſigns. Beſides, the proofs to be exhibited were not eaſily ſupplied, though, it muſt be confeſſed, the vile cringing herd of ambaſſadors that diſgrace their ſovereigns and themſelves at the murderous court of

St.

St. Cloud, had, by their recent conduct, ſhewn their readineſs to receive "ſuſpicions light as air" for "confirmation ſtrong as proofs of holy writ."

We hail, with heart-felt ſatisfaction, the noble ſpirit diſplayed by moſt of the Northern Powers, but more particularly by the magnanimous Sovereigns of Ruſſia and Sweden, who ſeem, at length, to entertain juſt notions of the inevitable effect of the unreſtrained and inſatiate ambition of Buonaparté, which aims at nothing leſs than univerſal empire, founded on the demolition of every exiſting throne and government, if ſuffered to proceed farther without oppoſition. It remains to be ſeen whether Pruſſia is equally alive to the general danger, and equally inclined to make amends for the incalculable evils which her crooked, miſtaken, and ſelfiſh policy, has been the means of inflicting on the oppreſſed and ſubjugated nations, which have fallen under the iron yoke of France, by adopting the only efficacious means for averting that danger. This ſubject, however, muſt be reſerved for future conſideration.

In our domeſtic policy, the firſt object of attention is a recent event, which cannot fail to impart the higheſt gratification to every loyal boſom —the reconciliation between our gracious Sovereign and the Heir Apparent to his throne. Various ſources of ſatisfaction ſpring from this event; firſt, as it conduces to the domeſtic happineſs and comfort of the Royal Family, which cannot but be infinitely dear to every good ſubject; ſecondly, as it affords a hope of the cordial co-operation, in political meaſures, of thoſe who are the moſt intereſted, as having the moſt to loſe, in the iſſue of the preſent conteſt; and thirdly, as it opens a proſpect of farther reconciliation, of the reſtoration of that perfect harmony which is of ſuch infinite conſequence, whether conſidered in a religious, a moral, or a political point of view. Moſt ardently do we wiſh that none of the hopes which have been thus raiſed may experience diſappointment; and in the full expectation that our wiſhes will be gratified, we ſhall abſtain from certain reflections, ſuggeſted by very prevalent reports, which we ſhould otherwiſe have deemed it our duty to ſubmit to the public.

The ſpirited conduct of our miniſters, in demanding a categorical anſwer from the Spaniſh Cabinet, reſpecting their intentions towards this country, and the deciſive means adopted for extorting ſuch anſwer, are favourable ſymptoms of the wiſdom and energy of their councils; and afford a well-grounded hope that they will neither be intimidated by the dread of difficulties or of dangers, nor deterred by the wily equivocations of doubtful friends, from purſuing that ſteady and conſiſtent ſyſtem of politics, a ſtrict adherence to which can alone reſcue this country in particular, and Europe in general, from the ruin with which they are threatened. Some ſhallow politicians have, from intereſted motives, affected to doubt the propriety of proceeding to the detention of the Spaniſh ſhips; and have maintained that miniſters muſt be criminal, unleſs they are prepared to prove, that the tribute paid by Spain to France, exceeded the value of the ſupport which, in the event of a war, the former was bound by treaty to afford to the latter. Theſe curious political arithmeticians, theſe wiſe calculators of deficits and ſurpluſſes, would not, forſooth, have a blow ſtruck, or a precaution taken, until the account current had been paſſed between the financial eſcamoteurs of Madrid and St. Cloud; until it had been accurately aſcertained, to the perfect ſatisfaction of every political ſceptic, whether Spain had paid a dollar more to France than the expence of the force which ſhe was engaged

to

to supply! These precious casuists never take the trouble to consider that, while they are employed in casting up their sums, and in solving their doubts, the mischief meant to be averted might be atchieved, the treasures of Spain might arrive at their place of destination, the Corsican treasury at Paris, and France be supplied with the means, which she so much wants, of carrying on the war against us. No doubt, the Corsican Usurper would gladly allow his degraded vassal, who preserves but a barren remnant of regal independence, to preserve the appearance of neutrality, so that he might be allowed to avail himself of his resources, and to appropriate the fruits of his rich colonies to his own use. In short, it is impossible to consider Spain in any other light than as a province of France, as completely governed by Buonaparté, as if he had erected his throne at Madrid; and, while it is notorious that he exercises despotic sway over her councils, her conduct, and her revenue, it would be as preposterous to suffer her to enjoy all the advantages of peace, and so enable her to increase the resources of her enemy, as it would be to sanction the neutrality of any province which constitutes an integral part of the French empire. God forbid! we should be the advocates of injustice or oppression of any kind; or that we should consider the act of engaging in a war with any power, as a matter of light or trivial moment!—But certain we are, that self-preservation calls for the adoption of strong and decisive measures; and points out the necessity of rousing all the nations of Europe to a defence of their own independence; of preventing them from becoming the tools of an unprincipled and ambitious usurper, and the instruments, in his hands, of promoting our ruin, by teaching them, that the danger of submission to his will, is not less than that to which resistance of his mandate would expose them; and equally certain we are, that a timid policy, or temporising measures, would, under the perilous circumstances of the times, be productive of inevitable ruin! We shall, hereafter, enter more at large upon this important subject.

The affairs of *Ireland* seem to call for the particular attention of our Government; and, indeed, to us, they appear to be hastening to a crisis. Early in the present month we received a letter from that country, containing the following passage: "At this time a popish committee or convention is sitting here (at Dublin) debating on their claims to *Emancipation*. Many of its members are traitors and incendiaries, who were deeply concerned in the Rebellion of 1798. Besides the nocturnal meetings of popish traitors in the county of Carlow, there have been numerous ones in the county of Kildare. There was evidently a strong sensation in the popish multitude in the province of Munster, as soon as it was announced that the Blockade of Brest was to be given up. They hoped for and expected the arrival of their French allies. Patroles of cavalry still continue to perambulate this city in the night." At the same time we received the information, which has since become public, that an address was preparing to be presented to Parliament in the ensuing session, in aid of the opposition to his Majesty's Government. Indeed, for what other purpose, than the creation of embarrassments in his Majesty's Councils, can such an address be presented at this time; after the known declaration of his Majesty's sentiments on that subject, who, as some distinguished members of the present opposition must well remember, unequivocally protested that he could not, without a breach of conscience, consent to such a measure as Catholic Emancipation; as he should consider such consent as a violation of his coronation oath. It is impossible, that the framers

framers of this address can suppose, that the firm purpose of his Majesty's soul is to be shaken by the fear of incurring their displeasure; or that they themselves should have any expectation of attaining its object. The fact is, that Mr. Pitt having been once favourable to such a measure, they hope to embarrass him, by bringing it forward at this period; since, if he support it, it will make him forfeit the favour of his Sovereign; and, if he oppose it, it will afford them an opportunity of charging him with a dereliction of principles. But the artifice is as shallow as the attempt is unprincipled. Mr. Pitt has too just a sense of the respect that is due to the throne, to give any countenance to a measure of great public importance, whatever his own private opinion of its merits may be, when he knows that the conscience of his Sovereign will not allow him to give it the royal sanction. By his acceptance of power, too, with such knowledge of the King's sentiments, he has given the strongest pledge that he will not, directly, or indirectly, encourage such a proceeding.

We have had such frequent occasions of discussing the question of *Catholic Emancipation*, which might, with greater propriety, be termed *Popish Ascendancy*; and our attention will be so frequently called to it hereafter, that we shall not enlarge upon it here. But we cannot refrain from repeating a remark, which we have very often enforced, that whatever indulgence is granted to the Irish Romanists, they are never satisfied; they regularly and progressively rise in their demands; their zeal partakes of the nature of the miser's thirst for gold, *quo plus habet, eo plus cupit;* and convinced we are, as well from the experience of past times, as from the very genius of their religion, and, indeed, from the language of the general councils of their church, whose decrees they dare not, and wish not, to disobey, that, were all their present demands complied with, a very short time would elapse, before new pretensions would be urged, nor would they rest, until theirs was the *established* religion of the United Empire. Let those who doubt the justice of this sentiment, refer to their professions and promises, when their champion, Mr. Grattan, procured for them the repeal of certain restrictive laws then in force against them. What new claim they can have to additional indulgence, at this particular crisis, when they have an accredited agent at Paris, and when every appearance seems to indicate the approach of new commotions at home, it is not easy to conceive!

But though a rooted attachment to the established religion of our country, with which its civil constitution is most closely connected, leads us most strenuously to deprecate any measure that affects its interests; yet, let it not be supposed that we have not the warmest wishes for the welfare and prosperity of our fellow-subjects in Ireland, of whatever persuasion.—These, however, would not be promoted by placing them on a level, in respect of political privileges, with the members of the established Church.—The self-convicted traitors of Ireland, when it was no longer their interest to wear the mask, acknowledged this fact; and confessed that the proposed Abolition of Tithes, Catholic Emancipation, and other notable revolutionary projects which they had proclaimed, were mere pretexts to allure the people to the standard of rebellion; and that their situation would not be meliorated by the accomplishment of their plans. How far this desireable object would be attained by rendering the Romish Clergy of Ireland "*Pensioners of the State*," we are not prepared to say. It is certainly a measure of a very different complexion from that of Emancipation; but it ought to be maturely

maturely weighed before it is adopted; and, to confess the truth, we have very strong doubts of its success. The *best* means of improving the condition of the people would, unquestionably, be the introduction of new manufactures, and the opening of new branches of commerce; by which a spirit of industry would be promoted, the means of subsistence enlarged, the acquisition of comforts facilitated, and civilization produced. For this purpose every encouragement should be given to commercial men of opulence and enterprize, to settle in Ireland. But no encouragement would suffice, we fear, until that restless and turbulent spirit, which has been so evidently cherished of late, was entirely subdued; and, therefore, the principal Romanists of that country would render a more essential service to the people, by tranquilizing their minds, and exhorting them to the observance of orderly and peaceable conduct, than by influencing their passions, with the hopes of chimerical advantages, which they can never obtain; and which, even if realized, could neither increase the stock of their comforts, nor enlarge the sphere of their happiness.

TO OUR READERS.

IN the Review of "Abicht's Encyclopædia of Philosophy," in the Appendix to our Eighteenth Volume, p. 487, some most unwarrantable reflections are cast upon the Authors and Editors of that very able publication, the Scotch Encyclopædia Britannica. Our readers will easily conceive, that a critical work must be entrusted to various hands, though superintended by one person, whose care it should be to preserve a perfect consistency and uniformity of principle throughout the whole. If then, this superintendant is prevented, by the visitations of Providence, or by any accidental cause, from discharging his duty, for a time, a danger of contradiction or inconsistency arises. In a circumstance of this kind, with the nature of which it is needless to trouble our readers, (though many of them, alas! are well acquainted with the fact!) is to be inscribed the insertion of the article in question, which the editor had never read. How any writer could brand men so distinguished in the annals of science, as a Robison, a Deig, a Gleig, a Barclay, and a Thomson, Men to whom we have, again and again, paid our just tribute of respect and applause, as ignorant, mean, and illiterate, it is difficult to conceive! It is our duty, however, to disclaim, in the most unequivocal terms, this unjustifiable attack upon Authors, not more eminent for their knowledge and abilities, than respectable for the purity of their lives, the soundness of their principles, and the excellence of their moral characters.